

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. IV.

JULY, 1903.

NO. 1.

Economic Interpretation of History

TO arrive at truth, we must examine into the facts unburdened by preconception. There is no doubt concerning this in the mind of any one. It is quite evident that in the attainment of truth, our critic, the Rev. Alexander Kent, in the May INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, himself "carries weights" in the form of the preconceptions of an intuitional philosophy. After the examination of certain facts to arrive at a judgment on these facts has been the privilege of all men; the present writer only claims that privilege.

I wish to put over against each other the position at which I have arrived, that "All social institutions are the result of growth, and that the causes of this growth are to be sought not in any idea, but in the conditions of material existence" (which, although credited as a quotation by my critic to Marx, was in reality taken in my former article from Prof. Edwin Seligman's "Economic Interpretation of History"), and the position from which our critic argues, "Institutions are only expressed and embodied ideas. Ideas invariably precede, contemplate and effect the changes."

A part of the difficulty lies in the understanding of the terms economic or materialistic and their opposite, idealistic. A mass of vague and ill-digested opinions concerning both of these terms is to be found among both socialists and non-socialists. Nothing is quite so common as to throw the word materialist at a man, attempting to carry with the word materialist the idea that the individual holding that belief is coarse, carnal, with no knowledge of the so-called higher life, and even addicted to vices.

There have been two great standpoints from which all study of society or history or philosophy has proceeded, the standpoint of idealism and that of materialism. The question lying at the basis of this is the foundation question of all philosophy. It is the ques-

tion as to the priority of mind or matter. Is matter a product of mind, or mind itself the highest product of matter? Did the mind originate first and produce matter, or is nature the source? Are the thoughts we have in our minds pictures of real things, or are these real things the pictures of this or that stage of some "absolute idea"?

Idealism means no more or less than this, that the believer in it holds that mind originated matter; that mind existed before matter, and that the things about us are only conditions resulting from the development of the great idea.

The economic or materialistic school holds that mind is the highest product of matter, that our consciousness and thoughts are evidences of a natural bodily organ, the brain, and that the ideas we have are pictures of the sensible, actual world around us. This in no way excludes the possibility of the making of tentative hypotheses or the holding of ideals by the believer in the economic view of society, as it is sufficiently clear that idealism does not depend on that point at all.

The theory of the economic or materialistic view of society has passed through its own particular evolution. The materialism of the time of the French Revolution at the close of the eighteenth century was purely mechanical. This was necessarily true. There could be no conception of the universe as a process. This was largely due to the condition in which we find science at that time. Only the "mechanics of gravity" had reached any definite conclusion. "Chemistry existed only in a childish phlogistic state, biology lay in swaddling clothes, all organisms of plants and animals were examined only in a very casual manner." Hence the narrow-mindedness of the French materialists was unavoidable. Since that time the development of the germ theory, the theory of the conservation of energy and the evolutionary theory have given materialism a basis in science.

Examine the position taken by scholars in the field of psychology in relation to the origin and growth of ideas and their mechanism. It is maintained that the nerve organs and the brain center through and by which thought is carried on have arisen and developed to meet the needs of life. The whole centralized nervous system has grown up in the division of labor in the human system. We are forced, then, to the conclusion that mentality and the very organs through which it operates have been developed through material necessities and practical needs.

Turn to still another field. Lester F. Ward is a recognized authority in Sociology. In his last book, called "Pure Sociology," page 288, he says: "Ample natural nourishment enjoyed by a whole people or by a large social class will cause a healthy development which will ultimately show itself through mental and physical superiority. Thus far such has been the history of

mankind, that there has always been a special class that has been able to attain the means thus fully to nourish the body. * * * Still, although slavery has been abolished and the feudal system overthrown, the new industrial society is largely repeating the pristine conditions and in the old world especially, and more and more in the new, class distinctions prevail, and differences of nutrition, of protection and physical exertion are still keeping up the distinction of a superior and inferior class. * * * This is, too, the great truth that lies at the bottom of the so-called historical materialism. Not only does civilization rest upon a material basis in the sense that it consists in the utilization of the materials and forces of nature, but the efficiency of the human race depends absolutely upon food, clothing, shelter, fuel, leisure and liberty."

When we come to apply this idea to history we find that it at once supplies what has always been lacking hitherto in the historical interpretation of society, it gives continuity to history. Various attempts have been made before the materialistic interpretation of history to secure this continuity.

One of the first attempts of an idealistic character to interpret events looked upon history as a series of biographies of great men. The best instance of this form of interpretation is to be found in Carlyle's "Hero Worship." According to this theory of historical progress, society stagnated for several years until, as one writer has said, "some great towering genius appeared to jerk it up a few generations, where it stuck fast until another great man came along to lift it another notch." According to this philosophy, it was George Washington and John Adams who made the American Revolution, Alexander Hamilton who gave us the Constitution, Thomas Jefferson who created the American spirit of democracy, Abraham Lincoln who freed the slaves.

Naturally this view of history suited the ruling class from which most of the historians, as well as most of the great men, came. It served effectually to retard the discovery of the social laws by which alone society progresses. Further, it agreed with the general catclysmic view of things prevailing at the time. Objection is taken to my position on Martin Luther. "How does the writer know that their words had no effect? How does she know that they did not help to make the conditions right and prepare the people for the fuller and stronger message that Luther brought?" We reply, how does our critic know, unless it be intuitively, that Luther's message was either greatly stronger or fuller than that of earlier priests? In short, how do we know any fact unless we study, as far as in our power, events?

In the article "Restricted Interpretation" in the same number of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW it is pointed out that I evidently fell myself into this "one man" theory in saying

that Frederick the Great was the creator of Prussia. This is a point well taken. It was with me, however, merely an unfortunate rhetorical expression.

The "great man" theory, attempting, as it does, to introduce "chance" into social progress, is untenable. The popular mind, invariably seeking an easy route to a cause, still clings to it. The discovery of the economic forces behind and around these so-called great men, without which forces they could have done nothing, has been the result of patient investigation made by many and cannot be lightly thrown aside.

In the same article by Mr. Ferris is found this: "Finally we come to Marx. * * * Here the Socialist shouts 'Eureka! Behold, we have at last found it.' Found what, the Eldorado? No, but the cause world, the solitary omnipotent cause of all things." The Socialists are not forced to the narrow position of either accepting the word of Marx without question or finding nowhere else a substantiation of their position when it comes to the economic interpretation of history. If the writer will take the trouble to read further he will find that the ablest men in both American and European universities, the men who are really producing anything and not rehashing old controversies, are approaching history, physiology, education, psychology and sociology from exactly this standpoint. This theory has quite as many supporters among non-Marxists as Marxists.

The following quotation is from the Rev. Josiah Strong, in his book, "The Times and Young Men": "Tell me one thing about a people, viz., how they get their living, and I will tell you a hundred things about them.

"A tribe that lives by the chase is savage. If a people gain their livelihood directly from domestic animals, they must wander to new regions as their flocks and herds require new pastures. That is, they are nomadic, and their food, their dress, their shelter, their government, their customs and their laws are such as always belong to a nomadic civilization. If a people get their living by cultivating the ground, the tent of the nomad gives place to a permanent dwelling, and the food, dress, form of government, laws and customs of an agricultural civilization differing as widely from those of a nomadic civilization as a house differs from a tent. If a people are commercial, all their habits and mode of life are more or less affected by contact with the strange peoples with whom they trade. Stimulated by the new ideas brought home by their merchants and sailors, they are progressive, and develop habits of mind and manners, arts, literature, virtues and vices as unlike those of the plowman and shepherd as are their occupations."

Returning to the article, "Causes of Social Progress," we find this statement: "Deficient as our people may be in the mat-

ter of ethics, they are much further advanced than they are in economics." This is a purely *ipsi dixit* statement, made without any attempt at confirmation. It reveals, however, again the intuitional standpoint of the writer. By those who have made anything of a study of ethics within the last fifteen years the evolutionary character of ethics is fully recognized. Evolutionary ethics demonstrates the conformity of each system of ethics to the economical stage with which it developed and existed. Acts and relations of men viewed as right under one social stage are "wrong" according to the judgment of other times and places. No such thing as universal ethics has ever been possible. "There can be no universal morality in the concrete," says Prof. Friedrich Paulsen, page 19, in his "System of Ethics." Again, page 25, he says: "Every moral philosophy is, therefore, valid only for the sphere of civilization from which it springs, whether it is conscious of the fact or not."

From what source have the people obtained these superior ethical ideas with which our critic credits them? Innately? But the doctrine of "innate ideas" is no longer recognized by modern men of science. Intuitionalism driven from one point to another attempted to find its last refuge in ethics. Writers like Rolph, Carnerie, Stephen, Heckel and Spencer have finally dislodged it from this last position. Read in the light of present scientific works on the subject, the above statement of our critic seems an absurdity belonging to the metaphysical past. The ethics today are such as capitalism has developed and are fitted to the present industrial system.

A little knowledge of American history is sometimes extremely valuable. Few indeed are the American scholars who would father the statement made by Mr. Kent that "The movement on the part of the American people which resulted in free Cuba, and in several other things which they did not contemplate, was undoubtedly due to considerations of humanity and in no degree prompted by the hope of economic benefits." Or, concerning the American people in the Philippine Islands: "Certainly they have not been influenced by any consideration of material profit realized in their lifetime." American scholars, and incidentally any man who knows anything of American politics, knows that the conditions existing in Cuba had existed for half a century and it is also well known that as early as 1858 a meeting was called at Ostend for the purpose of seriously discussing the seizing of Cuba from Spain if Spain would not sell. The southern slaveholding states favored seizure, as they desired to extend slave territory and increase southern votes. The north opposed and the south did not push it further, for things were already nearing a crisis. The matter was dropped, only to come up again when the capitalist interests of the United States demanded Cuba in

extending trade and commerce. A sentimentalism in the face of facts that would attempt to make the movement of the United States on Cuba due to "humanitarian" ideas has reached the limit of the absurd.

A very slight examination into world politics would have shown our critic but too plainly the economic interests that lie behind the movement in the Philippines. Here is the great coaling station for the United States on the route to the far east and also it gives her a foothold from which to operate in case of Chinese complications. Surely this teacher of the people would escape some ludicrous errors if he would familiarize himself with the facts of present economic and political life.

"Economic laws and forces have been at work in all ages and among all peoples, but there has been no uniformity of growth or progress even among people similarly conditioned as to soil and climate." We are compelled to say that this statement is not true and that the opposite is true. A study of anthropology, of comparative history as well as economics, has shown those who will take the trouble to look into the matter that there has been a uniformity of growth and similarity of institutions among people similarly conditioned until it has come to be a recognized law in sociology that tribes or nations that have reached the same plane economically have a marked similarity in institutions, beliefs, religion, morality and forms of government. In short, the larger part of modern science now rests on this very fact.

"Animals have the same material conditions, so far as soil, climate and environment generally are concerned, as man. Why do they not make the same social progress? . . . So far as we know their habits, customs, institutions—if one may so speak—are just what they were thousands of years ago."

Here again so far is this statement from true that its opposite is true. The word environment, as used by the majority of writers on sociological subjects, is quite evidently not clear to our critic when he states that animals have the same environment as man. Material environment in its generally accepted meaning signifies not alone soil, climate and so on but as well all social institutions, the inheritances of earlier civilizations. Some writers on economics, J. B. Clark, for example, in "Philosophy of Wealth," have recently made "material" environment to consist of all these and yet further of such things as the music of the orchestra and the voice of the speaker. Moreover, it is quite evident that our critic has not benefited himself by a study of modern evolutionary literature, else he would know that "thousands of years" are but a moment's space in the evolution of species and he would long ago have known that man himself, with his "remarkable" ideas," developed from brute ancestors and

that his very intellect has been the result of the material necessities of life.

"And yet she took the trouble to write this article to help people to clear thinking on this subject. If clear thinking has no relation to national economic action one cannot but wonder to what end she put herself to this trouble." This is quite a common form of convincing logic employed by those compelled to deal with disagreeable facts. The discovery of the law of gravitation did not immediately stop its operation, neither will the discovery of a social law retard its effect upon society. But perhaps our critic will not admit with us that society in its progress is governed by any law, but will hold rather that it is all a matter of chance. The work of any true student of society is to interpret facts and if possible discover the laws that govern social growth. It does not consist, on the other hand, in saying what to his mind these laws ought to be or in attempting to revise them. Lester F. Ward, in "Pure Sociology," says, "The idea that sociologists think they are engaged in '*revising*' social laws is decidedly refreshing. So far as I can see they are simply trying to understand them, just as the physicists tried to understand physical laws, and many of them doubtless have at least a mental reservation that, besides this knowledge for its own sake, some one may some day in some way be benefited by it."

But surely consistency is not a part of our critic's mental equipment. After assuming that institutions are only expressed and embodied ideas, what does he mean in closing when he says: "The level of a people's government, literature, education and ethical practice can never rise much above the level of its industrial life"?

The test of any theory is the extent to which it explains the facts of the case. In how far does the economic interpretation of history explain social progress? It holds that the driving forces behind social movements and in the building up of social institutions are the economic interests of contending social classes. Let us see how this thing works itself out. Men strive continuously through inventions to improve the tools with which they work and the manner of using them. The chip stone became the polished and the polished stone gave way to bronze, and bronze to iron. Iron was transformed into steel, tempered, wrought into more complex forms until the great intricate machine resulted. Man used levers, wheels and pulleys to increase and change the direction of his strength, then hitched domestic animals and finally wind and water and steam to these new and complex tools.

Every one of these changes produced changes in the carrying on of the whole process of production and this in turn grouped men in new forms, in new arrangements giving rise to new social institutions. When man had advanced to a point where these tools

became capable of producing a surplus and the idea of private property in the instruments of production and land upon which these rest arose social classes appeared. The great feudal ancient property in land is frequently ascribed in its origin to political causes through forcible seizure, but this explanation cannot be applied to the rise of the bourgeoisie and proletarian classes.

The origin and progress of these two great economic classes is clearly seen to be from economic causes. "It was . . . clear that in the fight between the land holding class and the bourgeoisie no less than in that between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat economic interests were the most important, and that the political force served only as a means of furthering these.

"The bourgeoisie and the proletariat both arose as a result of a change in economic conditions, or, strictly speaking, in methods of production. The transition, first from hand labor, controlled by the guilds to manufacture and thence from manufacture to the greater industry, with steam and machine force, has developed these two classes."

These conflicting economic interests of classes then are the compelling forces behind the motives of action of both the masses and their so-called "great men." They are the historic causes which transform themselves into motives of action.

From this time on institutions are formed and directed in the interests of the economic class which has control of the essentials of economic life. These institutions are always formulated in such a manner as to preserve all the privileges of this ruling class; the legal institutions will be elaborated to declare lawful and inviolate these privileges. The whole machinery of government will be used to maintain such privileges, while custom and public opinion will sanctify and endorse them.

With the division into economic classes a new dynamic to social progress appears in two forms. First the unrest of the subject class. This gives rise finally to a revolution in society when, as it frequently happens, a change in the manner of production brings a hitherto subject class into the position of controlling society. This was true when, in the Middle Ages, the trading and manufacturing classes rose to power. Changes in the method of production made machinery and trading capable of greater importance than landed estates; the class, therefore, that was in possession of these tools and instruments of communication rose to social domination and overthrew the old feudal nobility.

This class struggle in the second place shows itself in the constant attempts of the ruling class to improve and perfect the social institutions that stand for their interests. This gives rise to reform movements. They wish to improve civil service, abolish political corruption and boodling, insure economy in public administration and in general to improve the working of the

social machinery which conserves their interests. Their action in this direction is continually affected by the necessity of making concessions to a subject class, particularly if the latter show signs of rebellion.

This whole theory of society receives tremendous support from the biological point of view. The work of Wallace, Darwin, Spencer and Weissman and the great army of biologists who have revolutionized scientific thought and also practically revolutionized the whole field of intellectual life, has shown that progress in all fields of life depends upon adjustment to the environment. That form of organism, whether it be plant, animal, or social, which can best adjust the materials at its disposal for the task of utilizing its surroundings will survive. Every particle of matter must be arranged, every organ created in the manner which will best subserve this end. If an organ does not help in preservation it withers up and disappears.

One of the corollaries of this law is that progress means the elimination of waste. Hence it is that the moment a method of arrangement of the matter in any organism—plant, animal or social—appears which is more economical of energy than previously existing ones it is destined to supplant the wasteful one.

This law of economy or the law of "least effort" is one which applies in every field of growth. It insures the progress of invention and the universal adoption of any improvement in productive methods. It also insures the disappearance of any social organization as soon as a less wasteful one becomes possible. Hence it is that it is only necessary to show first, that the capitalist society is more wasteful than a co-operative system; second, that the co-operative system is in accord with the economic development of the present or immediate future in order to prove the inevitable evolution of capitalism into socialism.

Some explanation of one or two phases of the materialistic interpretation must be noticed. Those who have only a crude and half knowledge of the theory often assume that immediately on the economic organization of society being changed every social institution is at once completely and in every particular changed, and this without regard to what the previous form of the institution might have been. The fact is that each economic stage has to take all of the institutions and social organs which it inherited from the previous stage and must use this material in forming the new society. But these institutions have many of them lasted for thousands of years and they are anything but tractable material. This phase of the question corresponds to heredity in the biological world. Just as many times in the biological world the organism is so stable that it cannot adjust itself to the new environment, and so perishes, just so in society it is easily possible that the social institutions of any particular tribe,

race or nation might become so fixed that they could not conform to a new environment and the society to which it belongs would perish.

A little examination of this phase of the subject will show at once that it offers an explanation of the so-called influence of ideas upon history. Once a given economic environment has developed a certain psychological attitude, that attitude is inherited by the next social stage and may have a very great influence in determining the character of that social stage. The systems of justice, morality, etc., which have arisen in previous social stages undoubtedly have a part in determining social institutions today. But how? They constitute the material upon which present economic environment must act and they may so resist that environment as to greatly alter it, but when we analyze this back to its ultimate we find that it is not a conflict between ideas and environment but a conflict between a past and a present environment. This is, I hold, the fundamental point of the whole discussion and it is the position I maintained in my former article when I pointed out that no economic stage began its work *tabula rasa*.

In these last paragraphs I have answered the criticism of Mr. Ferris. He made his entire argument turn on one point—the attempt to discover a single cause lying at the basis of all social phenomena. “The economic principle controls man’s life,” says Prof. Carl Büchner, of the University of Leisipic, in his recent sociological work, “Industrial Evolution,” and the whole volume is an exposition of this point. All the other social forces are but manifestations of this underlying economic force. Psychology and brain physiology have shown that the brain of man, the seat of ideas, is itself a product of economic activity and needs. On what ground can Mr. Ferris’ criticism stand? Where, then, will he find the various, all apparently equal causes that produce social progress? Further, he is evidently unacquainted with the efforts of modern scientists who, in each field of science, are seeking to find the one great force back of the class of phenomena with which they have to deal. Physicists could do little or nothing until the discovery of the law of gravitation lying at the foundation of all forms of motion. The simplification of so-called causes is the endeavor of all science. Is it strange that sociology is seeking to do the same? Fifty years ago the dualism advocated by Mr. Ferris was lame and halting, and each discovery of science has helped to destroy its tenability, while these same discoveries have served to increase the strength and prevalency of monistic philosophy.

Finally, once the laws of social evolution have been determined, then ideas have another part, but no more an initiative part than before. It is not because of the *ideas* of gravitation that engineers

are able to move great masses, but because of the knowledge of that law, which is a very different thing. In the same way, when social laws are known, it will be possible for society to select at once those institutions which will best fit it to the environment of the immediate future and thus hasten progress. Up until the present time we have only been able to find out which institutions were suited to a changed environment by trying to preserve all of them and letting the environment destroy those which we were unable to preserve.

May Wood Simons.

The Economic Organization of Society

WHEN we carefully observe the social systems which are developing under our eyes in the several countries of both hemispheres we see that they all present the same phenomena; in all there is the absolute irrevocable division into two distinct classes, one of which without doing anything accumulates enormous and ever increasing revenues, while the other, much more numerous, works throughout its whole life for a miserable wage; the one lives without work, the other works without living—at least any human life. In the presence of a contrast so sorrowful and so striking, the problem presents itself at once to every reflecting mind: is this state of things the product of a natural necessity inseparable from the organic conditions of human nature, or is it not rather the result of historic causes destined to disappear in the later phases of evolution?

A long intellectual pilgrimage across the vast field of economic sociology has led me to the conclusion that the truth is to be found in the second answer, and that the division of humanity into two castes, the one composed of capitalists, the other of laborers, or, in other words, the existence of capitalist property has not been the product of inherent conditions of human nature, but rather of powerful historic causes which ought necessarily to disappear in a later period. The results of my researches may be summed up in that which follows.

I explain the genesis, character and tendencies of capitalist property as follows:

While free ground remains upon which any one may undertake cultivation with his own labor, while any man deprived of capital may, if he wishes, establish himself on his own account upon unoccupied ground, capitalist property is absolutely impossible because no laborer will submit to work for a capitalist when he may set up on his own personal account upon ground which costs him nothing. It is evident that under these conditions the workers can take possession of free ground, and devoting their strength to this, they will soon be able to add to their labor the capital they have accumulated.

If the productivity of the earth is high the producers of capital are not disposed to associate their labor because they have no interest in subjecting their own independence to the fetters which association imposes in order to increase a product already very abundant in itself; this is why the natural economic form under these conditions is isolated production; at least where the despotic authority of the state does not force the producers to associate.

If, on the contrary, the productivity of the earth is slight, the producers have a motive which will urge them to associate their labor in order to increase the product. Consequently, under these conditions the necessary economic form is that where the association of the producers of capital who work together divide the product into equal parts (pure association) or the free association where one or more producers of capital and one or more simple laborers work together and share equally in the product (mixed association).

But under all hypotheses the division of society into a class of non-working capitalists and a class of non-capitalist workers—being given free ground—is absolutely impossible, because under these conditions the reception of profit on the part of an idle capitalist is excluded by the very nature of things. If, then, the capitalist wishes to obtain a profit at any cost he can do this only by violently suppressing the free land to which the worker owes his strength and his liberty. Now, while the population is sparse and consequently the complete occupation of the earth is impossible, abolition of free ground may be accomplished only by the enslavement of the workers. This enslavement takes at first the brutal form of chattel slavery, then when the decreasing productivity of the soil ought to be compensated by much greater productivity of labor it is possible to substitute a form of service more gentle and more favorable to effective labor. This is why the property in man is the first base, the primitive pedestal of capitalist property.

We find a striking demonstration of this truth in a study of those countries having an abundance of free land, as, for example, the colonial countries. All who have studied the history of these enchanting regions declare unhesitatingly that they furnish a brilliant confirmation of our thought. They remind us of the marvelous tales of the primitive period of the United States during which this fortunate country is described as peopled with a noble class of independent workers, ignorant even of the possibility of capitalist property. They recall to us the letters of Washington, who speaks of the impossibility of the farmers obtaining any revenue whatever from their ground unless they cultivated it themselves with their own laborers. They repeat certain of the speeches of Parkinson, Strickland and all the other Europeans who traveled in America during the eighteenth century and who were astonished at this strange country where money *would do so little*. They explained, then, at the same time, the historic necessity of slavery and servitude in modern colonies of the Middle Ages and in ancient Europe as the only means of obtaining a profit during the period of free ground, and this explains equally without difficulty the tenacity with which the owners defend a system which produces so little and is so inconvenient even

for the capitalist himself. This also explains why in the Middle Ages that when the serfdom disappeared from manufacturing industry, while there were still fertile ground unoccupied, there developed a barbarous form of mixed association, the corporation of workshops—a corporation which, while dividing the product in equal proportions between the producer of capital (the patron) and the simple worker (the journeyman), especially excludes profits.

Finally, it does not astonish us if in the Middle Ages liberty of men and free earth engenders on the one side persecution of the laborers, having the special object of extorting by violence the profit which it was impossible to obtain otherwise; and on the other side laws against usury. Because the utter powerlessness of capital to obtain a profit in industrial enterprises rendered interest on capital inconceivable and led one naturally to look upon it as a result of theft or fraud.

But when, under the influence of an increased population, all the ground capable of cultivation by labor alone was occupied, the economic organization found itself suddenly transformed. Then, in short, the workers lost this option which constituted their defense against the usurpations of capital; then indeed the worker had no other means of living than by selling his labor power to the capitalist for the wage which it pleased this latter to fix; then he was truly forced to give up to the capitalist the better part of his product or to grant a profit to capital from this product, and it is this which created profit, no longer violent, but automatic and due to the progressive appropriation of the earth, which took from the workers all option and founded their economic servitude.

The occupation of the cultivable earth by labor alone is never able to absolutely assure the establishment of the capitalistic system, because there will always remain a large amount of unoccupied earth whose culture, to be sure, may not be undertaken without capital, but which does not require any considerable amount of capital. Now, if the laborers are able to accumulate this capital, they will thereby at the same time secure, together with the possibility of transporting themselves to free earth, their freedom of choice, and the abolition of all profit will be the inevitable result. The condition *sine qua non* of the persistence of the capitalist system is then the reduction of labor to the minimum which will not permit the workers to save, and it is indispensable therefore that the capitalist should seek in all possible ways to reduce the remuneration of the laborers to that which is absolutely necessary.

This minimum is attained through various methods: the direct reduction of wages, the depreciation of money, the employment of more costly machines than the laborers which they replace,

the expansion of unproductive capital employed in the affairs of the stock exchange and the bank, in metallic money, in public debts, a number of useless intermediaries, the creation of an excessive population which will compete with the employed laborers.

All these means work inevitably to limit production and consequently to diminish profit. The proprietary class, however, does not hesitate to have recourse to them because they are the necessary conditions for assuring even the continuance of profit by preventing the raise of wages, which would have for an inevitable result the cessation of capitalist revenues. When finally the later increase in population renders possible the complete occupation of the earth and its exclusive appropriation by the capitalistic class this suffices to abolish forever the choice of the workers and at the same time to insure the continuance of revenue to the proprietary class. The capitalist finds himself suddenly free from the necessity of having recourse to the costly and unproductive form of reducing wages in order to guarantee the continuance of his revenues; and the capitalist property becomes automatic, that is to say, it continues independent of all direct action of the capitalist against the liberties and the remuneration of the workers. In other words, it is then only necessary that capital should not be permitted to escape from the hands of the landed proprietors in order that a perpetual revenue should be assured to the class which does not work at the expense of the class which works.

The foundation of capitalist property is therefore always the same, that is to say, the suppression of free earth, the exclusion of the workers from the occupation of the earth, an exclusion which is obtained by various methods according to the various degrees of occupation and the productivity of the soil. Indeed, during the period when free earth exists, cultivable with labor alone, the production of the free earth is obtained only by means of slavery or serfdom, then when the unoccupied earth is only cultivable by those who possess capital they may obtain a revenue by means of the systematic reduction of wages to a level which will not permit accumulation by the laborers. Finally, when as a result of the increase of population it is possible to occupy all of the earth, they may obtain this income by the simple appropriation of the ground on the part of the capitalist class. The passage from one to the other of these successive forms of suppression of free earth is accomplished by means of an economic revolution which decomposes the social system which has become incapable of fulfilling this function and bringing forth a new form. But the suppression of free earth, at the same time that it influences distribution so powerfully, also exercises two very remarkable opposing influences upon social production. In reality while co-ordinating the efforts of slaves, serfs

and wage workers for an end determined by the proprietor, it renders the association of labor more close and at the same time more efficacious. But in associating them through coercion it confines production within very many sensible although progressively decreasing limits, thanks to the always less restrictive methods of the suppression of free earth. They give then to labor a productivity which is superior to that which it would have had if isolated, but inferior to that which it would have if it were freely associated. This is why it is that when the productivity of the soil is raised the free earth will give rise to the economic stage of isolated production and the suppression of the free earth is technically superior to free earth and is a factor of progress and of civilization. If, on the contrary, the free earth, when the productivity of the ground is feeble, determines the spontaneous association of producers, the suppression of the free earth is technically inferior and constitutes an obstacle to progress. Now, under the influences of the increase of population the fertility of the last earth cultivated, productivity decreases until it attains the limit where the free earth, if it exists, compels the spontaneous association of workers. Then the suppression of free earth, far from being a factor in the progress of production, becomes for the first time an obstacle to production, and the increasing exigencies of the ever more numerous population always renders more intolerable this fettered economic form. At the same time the always more restricted limits which it imposes on production creates a fatal decrease in the revenue of capital and finally its necessary annihilation, therefore we see the impossibility of the persistence of production under the control of the capitalist system and the necessity of its dissolution. This is why that society will finally be compelled, in order to avoid the increased misery, to re-establish free earth, according to each one the right to occupy the extent of earth which he can cultivate by his own labor upon the base of free property in land and establish the spontaneous association of labor, thereby establishing the economic form necessary for social equilibrium.

To resume. We find ourselves then face to face with two social forms absolutely opposed to each other. On the one side there is the mixed association which is founded upon free earth—that is to say, upon the right accorded to each one to occupy the extent of earth which he can cultivate by his own labor, and which includes the division of the product in equal proportion between the capitalist worker and the simple workers associated with him—a social form which excludes all class differences, eliminates privilege and in which all usurpation is unknown; on the other side there is the capitalist property, supported upon the suppression of free earth or upon the exclusion of the mass of humanity from the possession of the earth; an exclusion obtained

at first by means of slavery and serfdom and then by the reduction of wages and, finally, by the exclusive appropriation of the ground on the part of capital—a social form which divides the collective product into two great divisions, the wages of labor and the revenue of property, and which separates humanity into a class of exploited and a class of exploiters.

The mixed association constitutes the highest form—the limited form represents the last stage of development of a phenomena—of economic life, and that towards which social evolution is unconsciously tending. Capitalist property, in its progressive phases, represents the incomplete stages of evolution—the long and sorrowful period of elaboration through which alone may be obtained a definite organization of human economy. The former has a normal and absolute value, the latter a historic and transitory value. The first has as yet been manifested only in a fragmentary and sporadic manner during historic ages and at the present it appears only as an indistinct image on the extreme horizon of evolution, but if it is true that all phenomena and all problems ought to be studied in this limited condition, that is to say, in the most extreme phase of their evolution, it is self evident that the analysis of this highest form of evolution is necessary in order to appreciate the character of this evolution itself and in order to comprehend the nature of past and present economic relations, and in order to trace to its first cause their mysterious process.

Now it is easy to understand that the limited economic form which excludes all usurpation and all conflicts may persist by its own virtue, without recourse to special institutions to guarantee its integrity, but it is equally easy to understand that capitalist property, just because it is founded upon the exclusion of laboring masses from landed property and because that it is supported by violence and crime, cannot continue, on the contrary, and that just because of both these things.

From the very first it has felt the need of a series of economic means which assured the continuation of the suppression of the free earth upon which it is founded. But the capitalist property always has the need if it is to endure of a series of connective institutions which become a guarantee against all resistance upon the part of those who are excluded from the possession of the earth, in order to assure the acquiescence of its victims and prevent them from having recourse to insurrection or of giving themselves up to excesses. The most remarkable among these collective institutions are morality, law and political organization. And these great phenomena are accordingly an organic product of capitalist property, or at least they are fundamentally metamorphosed and adapted by it to the end of guaranteeing its own existence.—*Achille Loria, in L'Etoile Socialiste. Translated from the French by A. M. Simons.*

The Remuneration of Labor in the Co-operative Commonwealth

THE Socialist movement is the expression of the discontent of the working class of the world with the present capitalistic order of society, under which as a result of the private ownership by the capitalist class of the land and the machinery of production, industry is administered in the interest and for the private profit of the members of the capitalist class, while the actual producers of the wealth of the world, receiving but a mere fraction of the fruits of their labor, must suffer the pangs of poverty and privation in the midst of the abundance their toil has created. Thus, exploitation, which is the root evil of capitalism, as it is that which makes capitalism possible, is what Socialism aims to abolish. But if the purpose of Socialism is the abolition of exploitation and to make the existence of an exploiting or capitalist class impossible, the problem arises how to distribute among the citizens of the Socialist Republic the product of their joint labor so as to give each individual his just share and no one more or less than his just share. We are confronted by the question as to how the just share of each individual in the general labor product shall be determined or measured, and as to what shall be deemed to constitute a just share.

Is there, then, any principle governing the distribution of incomes and the remuneration of labor under Socialism that is universally accepted at the present time by Socialists? No. On the contrary. The widest divergence of opinion prevails among the advocates of the new social order concerning this most important and most practical question. Two main streams or tendencies of thought upon this subject may, however, be recognized, and these we shall here consider.

There is, first, the view of those who hold that the remuneration of the individual laborer under Socialism shall be based upon the average social time required in the production of the particular article upon which the labor has been expended; such remuneration or labor credit to be equal in purchasing power to the price of any article in the production of which an equal amount of social labor time has been required; the prices of commodities to be thus equal to the value of the labor required in their production, as measured in time, and the value of labor to be equal to the prices of the products.

On the other hand, the adherents of an influential and numerically important rival school, assert that it is impossible under the present complex and interdependent system of industry, to discover the exact share or value of each individual's labor in the production of wealth, and that even if this were possible yet the fact that the co-operation of the whole of society and the accumulated experience of all past society so vastly multiplies the powers of the individual as to dwarf the value of his purely personal contribution of productive effort into significance, would make distribution upon the basis of the labor performed or of the alleged value of such labor impracticable as well as unjust; and that, therefore, the only solution of the problem of distribution under Socialism is to be found in the principle of equality of incomes; every citizen to be given the right of equal participation in the product of the combined labor, and to be expected, in return, to give forth his own best efforts in productive activity for the common weal.

In regard to the first of these proposals, namely, that the remuneration of labor be based upon the average time required in the production of the given article upon which the labor has been expended, the limited space at our disposal will only permit us to point out as a sufficient reason for the rejection of this plan, that if we may rightly take the quantity of labor expended, as measured in time, as the basis of its remuneration, there is no reason why the quality of the labor as well as other factors that could be mentioned as influencing the manner and result of such labor should not also be considered in determining its remuneration. If inequality of earnings is justified by the difference in the amount of *time* which different individuals may devote to labor, it is also justified by the difference in the *nature* of the labor which different individuals perform.

There remains, then, to be considered, that other plan for the distribution of the general social product, according to which society will guarantee to each individual an equal share or purchasing power in the entire consumable wealth of the nation, and will, in return, require the surrender for social use of each individual's labor power under as nearly equal or equalized terms and conditions as possible.

As we have seen, the main argument advanced in support of the principle of equality of incomes, is, that the productive efficiency of the individual is due to the co-operation of natural and social forces and to the inheritance of natural and social opportunities, both as expressing itself in his environment and in his own physical organism, and that as the individual is thus himself a product of nature and society, while any so-called personal superiority which he may possess, is a superiority in performing the various functions of life amid an environment cre-

ated by nature and society, the product of his labor is not individual but social and universal, and that it belongs to him only as conferred upon him by authority of society, and by virtue of his equal membership in society, and that, hence, for society to decree the equal division among all its members of the social industrial product, is not only for it to act strictly within its right but is the only act consistent with right and the only act according with logic.

The answer that must be given to this is that the law which has governed the development of life and the rise and progress in the scale of being both of individuals and of societies; the cosmic law in subordination to which and as the outcome of which the individual man of today and human society of today along with all other living beings and all other societies of living beings, have arisen, after countless ages of stress and struggle, from out the formless slime at the bottom of the primeval sea; that law has been, that "every individual," whether living in isolation or in association with its fellows, "shall gain by whatever aptitude it has for fulfilling the conditions to its existence."* For society to endeavor to annul this law, would be to make war against the very conditions to which it owes its own existence, and to which all the progress that has been hitherto achieved has been due, and it would be to cut away the foundations for all future individual progress and all future racial development.

Race progress in the past has been consequent upon the operation of the law that each creature shall enjoy the benefits accruing to it from the possession of superior ability to meet the conditions of its existence; for since such benefits involved greater opportunity to perpetuate its stock into posterity by means of descendants, there has been as a result a constant increase within each species of the proportion of its members possessing such superior ability; and it has been this constant infusion in an increasing ratio into each generation of every species of the best blood of each preceding generation, which has been the lever that has raised life up to its present high state of development.

This materialistic conception of race progress, which corresponds to and in a manner includes Marx' materialistic conception of history is founded upon the solid rock of modern positive science, and it applies as well to the human race as to the lower races, and it applies as well to the future, though not, perhaps, the very remote future, as it does to the present. The Utopian ideas of a mathematical equality of incomes and of the communistic distribution of products, which have come down to us from the early Socialists, originated at a time when the modern doc-

*Herbert Spencer in "Data of Ethic." Chap. XI, §69.

trine of evolution and the method of evolution were unknown. The time has come, however, when an attempt should be made to definitely and clearly demonstrate to the world that, contrary to the prevailing impression, there is nothing in the philosophy of Socialism, rightly understood, inherently at variance with the philosophy of evolution, and that there is nothing in the principles of evolution opposed to the essential truths of Socialism.*

However, it is not here contended that in the distant future, as a result of the changes to be wrought by evolution both in the nature of the race and in its environment, the institutions that would today be found wholly impracticable, might not under the far different conditions of that period become eminently suitable for the people of that age, while, on the other hand, the most deep-rooted customs and institutions of the present era might not in their turn then become obsolete. But Socialism as a movement of the present day does not come for the purpose of bringing about the indiscriminate overturning of all existing institutions. Socialism is the natural outgrowth of an industrial development which has reached the period of its maturity; an industrial development which is marked by the gradually increasing inadequacy of the individualistic system of production to meet the requirements of society, and which is bound to terminate in the abolition of the system of individualistic or private ownership and administration of the machinery of production and in the inauguration of the system of collective or public ownership and administration. When we shall but have removed the incubus of rent, interest and profits from off the backs of the world's producers; when the root evil of the present social economy, private capitalism, shall have been cut out of our civilization, it will not be necessary to make any further fundamental changes in the social organization to insure justice in the distribution of wealth, nor will it be required to invent arbitrary rules for the remuneration of labor to substitute for the natural law governing wages under freedom.

The economic law which today regulates wages in the different employments needs but to be freed from its enforced connection with the system of class monopoly of the means of production to be enabled to automatically yet equitably determine the remuneration of labor under more just industrial conditions.

*Such an attempt has recently, indeed, been made by Enrico Ferri in his book on "Socialism and Modern Science." While this work is an encouraging sign of an awakening to the need of reconciling the modern view of race progress and the modern view of social progress—the doctrine of Darwin and the doctrine of Marx—it fails to touch the subject in more than a merely nominal manner, avoiding the points of greatest apparent conflict between these two divisions of the new thought, and the book, in consequence, can scarcely be said to be convincing.

Under a regime of equality of opportunity to the means of production and individual freedom in the disposition of one's labor power, there is a natural economic law which if it be made the basis for the regulation of the rates of wages throughout the various employments, labor will be as certain to find its just reward as water is to find its level. That law is none other than the law of supply and demand. By raising wages in occupations and places where the supply of labor is less than the demand (as determined for the demand for the particular commodities produced) and by lowering wages where the supply exceeds the demand, labor will be stimulated to flow towards the various points of production in proportion to the demand for labor in each particular industry and in each particular region, and its remuneration will be governed by the valuation placed upon it by the laborers themselves.

As the demand for commodities under the Co-operative Commonwealth will only be limited by the productive capacity of society, owing to the prices of commodities being based upon the bare cost of production, the total demand for labor will always be equal to the total supply, and hence, as no one need ever suffer for lack of employment, no one need accept work or remain at work at an unsatisfactory rate of remuneration if in other branches or conditions of employment labor requiring equal skill or effort is paid more. Every individual being guaranteed the right to labor at any work he may be capable of doing, no class of workers could maintain a monopoly of a more desirable employment, nor could the rate of remuneration in any industry be kept higher than the general level of wages for an equal class of work, owing to the flow of labor that would set in towards such more favored occupation. The true value of every species of labor will thus be determined by the amount of remuneration which it will be necessary to offer in order to attract or retain a supply of labor equal to the demand in any stated employment, and in every employment the remuneration paid to the worker will thus represent the true value of his work.

The advantages of this system of remunerating labor and distributing the product of the general industry under the Co-operative Commonwealth will be readily apparent to the thoughtful reader. The objections most frequently urged against Socialism by its honest opponents are really objections against that "regime of *status*" and the consequences of such a regime which it is erroneously believed to involve. When it can be shown, however, that Socialism in no way carries with it the necessity for any restriction upon the economic liberty of the individual, in the sense in which economic liberty on the part of the wage earner is now understood, and when it can be shown that the income of each individual worker under Socialism will correspond to his

own industry and productive efficiency, and will be determined, not by arbitrary decision of human authority but by the impartial justice of a natural law, such objections must lose all their force, though not before.

There might be some foundation for the fear expressed by Herbert Spencer, that Socialism would result in the establishment of "a military despotism of the most severe type," if Socialism really involved the adoption of industrial arrangements under which the individual worker would have no deciding voice in the disposition of his own labor power and no material interest in the results of his labor; but this fear becomes groundless if we are permitted to assume that the "industrial army" of the future republic will be a volunteer army of willing workers, co-operating without compulsion in the service of society and receiving each his reward according to his deeds.

No doubt the law of supply and demand, as it operates today under a capitalistic economy, works injury to the interests of the laboring classes. Where one class in society owns all the means of production and the remainder of the population must compete with one another for the right to labor, the tendency of wages must necessarily be to fall to the minimum point at which life can be supported. Far different, however, must it be where the machinery of production is the common property of the whole people and the entire product of industry must be divided among those who produce it; where the industrial mechanism of society is operated for the express purpose of providing the largest product at the least cost to the consumers and full employment at the highest remuneration to the producers; where every worker is afforded the utmost opportunity of qualifying himself for the most desirable employments and every employment is open under equal terms to every individual.

Under such conditions only the best results must follow from permitting the mutual competition of the workers to regulate the rate of remuneration in every industry, and there can be no other method of regulating the rate of remuneration under the Co-operative Commonwealth that would be just to all members of society and that would involve no arbitrary interference with and infringement upon the liberty and dignity of the individual. As the competition would not be, as now, between an army of starving unemployed, on the one hand, and those fortunate enough to have employment, but far otherwise, would consist simply of a flow of labor from the occupations that at a given time appear less desirable to the occupations that at the same time appear more desirable, the effects of this system of adjusting wages according to the law of supply and demand, would be to equalize the desirability of the various employments; to reduce the prices and stimulate the consumption of commodities requir-

ing particular skill or talent in their production; to raise the standard of individual efficiency and ambition; and to increase the general wealth and the annual product of wealth of society.

Thus, divested of those paternalistic and authoritarian features which certain *doctrinaires*, in their mad craving for an artificial and imposed equality, would mischievously fasten upon the idea of the Co-operative Commonwealth, it becomes clear that Socialism, by no means involves any curtailment of or impertinent tampering with the liberty of the individual, even in his industrial relations; that it does not require the adoption of that principle of equality of incomes, which in the present state of human nature, would, indeed, be fatal to effort and destructive of the conditions of organic progress; and that it does not necessitate the "regeneration of the human race," and the consequent crushing out of individuality. On the contrary, in putting an end to the monopoly by the few over the means of employment upon which depends the very existence of the many, Socialism, we thus see, would make for a fuller and more widely diffused liberty than has ever been known before; in basing income upon labor and not upon the exploitation of labor, it would stimulate efficiency and promote the rise of the most worthy; and in establishing equality of opportunities for all, it would the more effectively insure the development of the individuality of each. Socialism, instead of being antagonistic to race progress, would provide the only environment under which true race progress can be effected; instead of dragging all down to the same low level it would raise mankind to a state of culture and refinement unparalleled in history; and instead of bringing in its train disorder and distress it would usher in an era of perpetual peace and plenty.

Raphael Buck.

Economic Aspects of Chattel Slavery in America

WHEN I wrote the pamphlet, "Class Struggles in America," the one great problem which confronted me was what to leave out. There was one phase of American history which I specially felt required further attention, and that was the subject of this article. Even now, when I come to go over the material which I have accumulated on the subject, I am forced to realize that the space which is at the disposal of a magazine article is ridiculously inadequate for any thorough treatment of American chattel slavery, even in the single aspects of its relations to economic history. Since the positions which a true interpretation of the facts compels me to take are so frequently at variance with, or directly opposed to, those which are held by a great majority of our people, I have made a much wider use of quotations than would ordinarily be desirable. By this means each reader is enabled to judge for himself as to the soundness of the position taken and in how far my interpretation of the facts is correct.

In the early days of colonization America was looked upon simply as a field for exploitation by the ruling capitalist class of Europe. Companies were formed who expected to realize fortunes for their organizers from the new country. But as pointed out by Achille Loria, in an article which appears elsewhere in this issue of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, exploitation in a new country is absolutely impossible while free land exists and industry is in a low degree of technical development. If the companies and individuals who were planting colonies in America were to receive any surplus value chattel slavery was absolutely essential, and the first and most natural move was to attempt the enslavement of the Indian. Columbus was the first one who tried this and the experiment was repeated over and over again during the next two hundred years and always with the same result. The Indian would die but he would not become a slave. It is somewhat difficult to account for this from the point of view of economic determinism. There was little difference in the stage of race development obtained by the North American Indian and that of the African negro, yet the latter made the best slave the world has ever known, while the other proved himself capable of resisting all attempts to enslave him. To be sure there were a few exceptions to the rule. The Indians of Mexico and Peru were enslaved, but as is well known these belonged to a different social stage, if not a different ethnical

branch than the other tribes. Incidentally, it is a sort of grim tribute to the proud Castilian that the half breed Spaniards could always be made to submit to a master without difficulty.*

There were but two ways in which America could be opened up to settlement and both played an important part, one by free labor yielding no surplus but laying the foundations for wage labor and the other way by chattel slavery in exploiting some industry where unintelligent labor and crude tools could produce a surplus subsistence for the slaves.

Taking the Colonial period a sharply defined distinction in the industrial organization of the northern and southern colonies appears. Before proceeding directly to this, however, it is worth while to note that through one of those strange happenings which gives to our imperfect knowledge of causes an effect we must still call coincidences, the Southern portion of the United States was settled largely by the Cavalier element of England while the Northern Colonies derived their main strength from Puritan stock. The interesting point lies in the fact that in Europe it was just the Cavalier who represented the old feudal organization of society, with its servile system of labor, while the Puritan is the representative of the rapidly rising bourgeoisie which was to rest upon the status of wage slavery.

In the beginning all the Colonies held slaves, indeed slavery was retained in almost all the Colonies until several years after the Revolution. It gradually, however, died out as it proved impracticable, and after it had died out laws were generally passed to abolish it. For example, when Vermont abolished slavery there were just nineteen slaves within her boundaries.

The physical conditions which in the early stages of society are always prominent in determining the economic basis of the social structure, created a sharp division between the Northern and Southern Colonies. Perhaps it is more accurate to say rather that it divided the Colonies into three groups: first, the Northern or New England Colonies, mainly occupied with ship-building, commerce and fishing; the Middle Colonies, occupied mainly with manufactures and small farming, and the Southern Colonies, confined almost exclusively to tobacco and rice. None of these industries, save tobacco and rice farming, afforded any large surplus with crude tools and unskilled labor, and consequently chattel slavery was practically impossible. It is noticeable, however, that white servitude in the form of indentured

*On enslavement of the Indians see "The Negro in Maryland," by Jeffrey R. Brackett, in "Johns Hopkins University Studies in History and Political Science," extra Vol. VI, pp. 5 to 20 *passim*; and "History of Slavery in Virginia," by Jas. C. Ballagh, same studies, Vol. XXIV, pp. 35-36 and 49-51; and Walterhausen's "Die Arbeits-Verfassung der Englischen Colonien in Nord Amerika," pp. 80-88.

servants prevailed in all the Colonies, and in the thirteen States until some time after the Revolution. As this subject has been thoroughly treated elsewhere I will not attempt to go into it here.

The following quotation from Lodge's "Short History of the English Colonies in America," p. 64, will show how absolutely the Virginia social organization rested upon tobacco: "The explanation of the condition of trade and industry is to be found in the absorption of the population in the cultivation of tobacco. There has never been a community, probably, in which any one great staple has played such a part as in Virginia. Tobacco founded the colony and gave it wealth. It was the currency of Virginia; as bad a one as could be devised, and fluctuating with every crop; yet it retained its place as circulating medium despite the most strenuous efforts to introduce specie. The clergy were paid and taxes were levied by the Burgesses in tobacco. The whole prosperity of the colony rested upon it for more than a century, and it was not until the period of the Revolution that other crops began to come in and replace it. The fluctuations in tobacco caused the first conflict with England, brought on by the violence of the clergy, and paved the way for resistance. In tobacco the Virginian estimated his income and the value of everything he possessed, and in its various functions as well as in its method of cultivation it had a strange effect upon the character of the people." . . . Page 65: "Tobacco planting made slaves necessary and profitable, and fastened slavery upon the province. The method of cultivation, requiring intense labor and watching for a short period, and permitting complete idleness for the rest of the year, fostered debts which alternated feverish exertion and languid indolence."

The subject of the colonial slave trade is one which throws a large amount of light upon many different phases of the development of class interest. In the first place, it is undoubtedly true as was pointed out by David Christy in his work, "Ethiopia—Her Gloom and Glory":*

"The records of history put it beyond all question that the rapid rise of Great Britain during the eighteenth century, which secured to her the superiority over other nations in naval power, in commerce, and ultimately in manufactures, was due principally to her having acquired by the treaty of Utrecht, 1713, the monopoly of the slave trade. The traffic in slaves being by the treaty placed under the control of England, her rivals were deprived

*Geo. McHenry, "The Cotton Trade," a pro-slavery book published in England in 1863, p. 2, says: "In fact, the African trade was the foundation of the commercial wealth of England, that of India being secondary in date and advantage; and the cotton manufacturing interest, the result of slave labor, has been of greater consequence than either." See also pp. 188-198.

of the means of supplying slaves to their tropical possessions, excepting through her merchants, while she could add to her colonies any number required by the planters."

In the treaty of Utrecht, to which reference is made above, an agreement called the Asiento was signed, which gave the Royal African Company, of which Queen Ann owned one-quarter of the stock, a monopoly of the slave trade. It is interesting to note the attitude of the colonies towards the slave trade. Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Vermont, with a great show of self righteousness, abolished the slave trade without, however, publishing the fact that they never had had any to abolish. New England stood in a very peculiar situation towards the slave traffic. It was the New England sailors and traders who were the principal carriers and traders in the slaves.

The New England ships loaded with rum from local distilleries sailed to Africa, where they exchanged this for negroes, and then sailing for the Southern ports of the United States, they sold the negroes for cash, and making the short trip in ballast to the West Indies they bought shiploads of molasses which, when brought back to New England, formed the raw material for more rum, and so on. As Du Bois, in "Suppression of the African Slave Trade to the United States," pp. 28-29, says: "This trade formed a perfect circle. Owners of slave-ships carried slaves to South Carolina and brought home naval stores for their ship building; or to the West Indies and brought home molasses; or to other colonies and brought home hogsheads. The molasses was made into the highly prized New England rum and shipped in these hogsheads to Africa for more slaves. Thus the rum distilling industry indicates to some extent the activity of New England in the slave trade. In May, 1702, one Captain Freeman found so many slavers fitting out that in spite of the large importations of molasses he could get no rum for two vessels. In Newport alone twenty-two stills were at one time running continuously; and Massachusetts annually distilled 15,000 hogsheads of molasses into this chief industry.'

Thus it is that we are not surprised to learn from Du Bois: "In the line of definite legal enactments to stop New England citizens from carrying slaves from Africa to any place in the world, there were, before the Revolution, none."

Again, he tells us on page 37: "The system of slavery had, on this soil and amid these surroundings, no economic justification and the small number of negroes here furnished no political arguments against them. The opposition to the importation was, therefore, from the first based solely on moral grounds, with some social arguments. As to the carrying trade, however, the case was different. Here, too, a feeble moral opposition was early aroused, but it was swept away by the immense economic ad-

vantages of the slave traffic to a thrifty seafaring community of traders. This trade no moral suasion, not even the strong 'Liberty' cry of the Revolution, was able wholly to suppress, until the closing of the West Indies and Southern markets cut off the demand for slaves."

The Southern Colonies from the very first offered much more opposition to the slave trade than the Northern ones. The defenders of these States have been quick to seize upon this fact as "indicating a higher moral standard" on their part. But a very slight examination will show that their opposition to the slave trade was no more disinterested than the Northern friendliness. Some of these States, particularly Virginia and North Carolina, already had as many slaves as could be profitably employed with the prevailing stage of industry. They had also entered upon the industry of raising slaves for sale to more southern colonies, and to such new plantations as might be formed in their borders. Consequently, they looked upon obstacles to the slave trade much in the light of protection to a home industry. Another reason which was frequently given in the laws themselves was the fear of slave insurrection. The black population much outnumbered the whites and there had been several cases of such insurrections.

Another and more obscure reason than any of these, although a reason which is closely connected with the first given, is the fact that at this time the production of cotton was still so hampered by the difficulty of separating the fiber from the seed as to make its production on any large scale unprofitable. Hence it was that Virginia continuously sought to increase the tax upon importations of slaves and resisted the efforts of the British Government to further the interests of the slave traders.

Virginia continued to increase the tax upon importations and to struggle with the British Government, which wished to further the monopoly. Numerous acts were passed by the Virginia Colonial Legislature respecting slavery, and it is well known that Jefferson, Washington, Patrick Henry and a majority of the Southern men of colonial times were opposed to slavery. The following quotation from a lecture delivered by St. George Tucker, professor of law in the University of William and Mary, and one of the judges of the General Court of Virginia, in 1796, concerning the contest with England on this point, gives an idea of Southern opinion at this time:

"It is easy to trace the desire of the Legislature to put a stop to the further importation of slaves, and had not this desire been uniformly opposed on the part of the Crown, it is highly probable the event would have taken effect at a much earlier period than it did. . . . The wishes of the people of this colony were not sufficient to counterbalance the interest of the English

merchants trading in Africa, and it is probable that however disposed to put a stop to so infamous a traffic by law, we should never have been able to effect it so long as we might have continued dependent on the British Government, an objection sufficient in itself to justify revolution."

In a work by George McHenry, entitled, "The Cotton Trade," and which was written in 1863 to enlist sympathy in England for the Confederate States, we find the following (pp. 198-199): "The legislation of all the Southern communities, both as colonies and states, for more than 165 years—certainly commencing as far back as 1698—has been distinguished by constant efforts either to embarrass or entirely prohibit the African slave trade. Alone among the nations of Christendom, though fruitlessly against the unanimous policy of the European governments, they struggled to prevent the increase of slaves from Africa upon the American continent. . . . Not one of the Yankee states has ever enacted laws prohibiting that commerce."

At the time of the Revolution Virginia had practically stopped the importation by a tax of £100 per head, and in 1788 it completely prohibited the importations. North Carolina also prohibited the importation in 1786. South Carolina and Georgia, however, were largely engaged in rice farming, and this returned great profits on slave labor. The proprietors of Georgia, however, had founded it largely as a buffer colony between the Spanish and English possessions. They felt that negroes would be a source of military weakness and consequently Oglethorpe posed as a great friend of humanity and opponent of slavery and fought continuously to keep the slave trade out of Georgia. The ordinary school histories generally accord him much praise on this point, but we learn from John R. Spears' "American Slave Trade," page 95, that "the fact is that Oglethorpe was deputy governor of the Royal African Company . . . which delivered many more than 4,800 slaves into the American colonies in the very year when Oglethorpe made a speech on the slave trade declaring it a horrible crime. He also owned a plantation near Parachucla, South Carolina . . . worked by slaves."

Finally, however, the interests of the local planters prevailed and Georgia secured the right to import slaves in 1749. There were numerous restrictions and a duty was laid upon each slave imported. But Du Bois says, page 8: "It is probable, however, that these restrictions were never enforced and that the trade thus established continued unchecked until the Revolution."

Some idea of the extent of the slave trade is given by Du Bois, page 5, as follows: "From 1680 to 1688 the African Company sent 249 ships to Africa, shipped there 60,783 negro slaves and after losing 14,387 on the middle passage, delivered 46,396 in America. . . . To these figures must be added the unregistered

trade of Americans and foreigners. It is probable that about 25,000 slaves were brought to America each year between 1698 and 1707. The importation then dwindled but rose after the *Asiento* (1713) to perhaps 30,000. . . . Bancroft places the total slave population of the continental colonies at 59,000 in 1714, 78,000 in 1727 and 293,000 in 1754. The census of 1790 showed 697,897 slaves in the United States.”*

By the time of the Constitutional Convention America had entered upon a new industrial era and there were signs of new class lines. But in any study of the work of this Convention it must be borne in mind that it was in a very slight degree a representative body. It was composed almost exclusively of representatives from the ruling classes of the coast regions, and was practically composed of the representatives of the trading, manufacturing and plantation classes. This was natural, as it was these classes above all others who desired the strong central government which was hoped might come from closer union. Nevertheless, we shall find, with few exceptions to the rule, that the delegates to the Convention lined up on all matters that came before them according to the material interests of the ruling classes of the colonies from which they came and that these interests were still largely the same as has been indicated in the colonial study. The New England coast States, including New York, were theoretically opposed to slavery, and their representatives occasionally did some talking for effect in opposition to slavery. But whenever they were called upon to act they were always very generous with favors to the slave trade in which they were quite closely interested. The Middle States, including Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware, being almost exclusively devoted to diversified agriculture and small manufacturing, were inclined to be decidedly abolitionist.

Virginia and Maryland being largely engaged in the raising of slaves for the southern market were anxious to restrict the foreign slave trade and occasionally talked abolition. North Carolina was on the border between Virginia and South Carolina, both geographically and politically. South Carolina and Georgia were completely given up the idea of the perpetuation of slavery save that even here there was a feeling that when talking for publica-

*John R. Spears, in “The American Slave Trade,” sums up the position of the colonies as follows (pp. 96-97): “It may be said generally that, with the exception of Georgia, every colony did at one time or another impose taxes on imported negro slaves, and that in some cases the so-called restraint amounted to prohibition. But with this admission it must be declared that every such tax was laid either through greed, or through the idea that from a business point of view white servants would develop the country more rapidly; or through a mean and degrading fear of the blacks. * * * The assertion that the British forced the traffic on unwilling colonists in America is a puling whine.”

tion it would be well to admit the evil of slavery. For instance, we find Abraham Baldwin, of Georgia, saying concerning that State (Elliott's Debates, page 459): "If left to herself she may probably put a stop to the evil." Gouverneur Morris (pages 391-2) denounced slavery unqualifiedly in an oration which afterwards became a classic of the Abolitionist, who, however, forgot to note that a little later on in the convention, in return for some trading privileges he proposed (page 477) to grant to North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, a special guaranteed perpetual right to import slaves. Indeed the only State which voted unqualifiedly for the motion to insert the word "free" before "inhabitants" on the question of representation was New Jersey. The main debate took place over the proposition to tax the importation of slaves and here the lines of division were very clear.

It was Luther Martin, of Maryland, who proposed the tax. (Page 457.) John Dickinson, of Delaware (pages 459-50), "Considered it inadmissible on every principle of honor and safety that the importation of slaves should be authorized to the States by the Constitution." The attitude of Virginia is seen by the quotation from George Mason, where he declared (page 458): "This infernal traffic originated in the avarice of British merchants. The British Government constantly checked the attempts of Virginia to put a stop to it. Maryland and Virginia had already prohibited the importation of slaves expressly. North Carolina had done the same in substance."

Hugh Williamson, of North Carolina (pages 466 and 477), said that "Both in opinion and practice he was against slavery, but * * *" and finally he thought the United States could not be members of the Union if the clause should be rejected. When we come to the New England States we find New Hampshire (page 460) strenuous for the exclusion. Of course it may have been a mere incident that New Hampshire, having no sea-ports, was not able to make any money out of the traffic, but it is interesting to find Eldridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, declaring that he "thought we had nothing to do with the conduct of slaves as to States," while Nathaniel Gorham, from the same State (page 461), frankly stated what I have been trying to show throughout this whole article that "he desired it to be remembered that the Eastern States had no motive to union but a commercial one."

Connecticut was looking with favor on this traffic and Roger Sherman, of that State (page 457), speaking on the proposition to levy a tax on the importation of the slaves, declared that "he disapproved of the slave trade; yet as the States were now possessors of slaves, as the public good did not require it to be taken from them, and as it was expedient to have as few objectors

as possible to the proposed scheme of government, he thought it best to leave the matter as we find it."

Luther Martin declares that (page 61 of "The Constitution a Pro-slavery Compact," by Wendell Phillips): "I found the Eastern States, notwithstanding their aversion to slavery, were very willing to indulge the Southern States, at least with a temporary permit to prosecute the slave trade, provided the slave states would, in their turn, gratify them by laying no restriction on the Navigation Acts."

Wilson, in his "Rise and Fall of the Slave Trade," Vol. I, page 52, in describing this agreement, says: "Thus New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Connecticut stand on the record as parties to a dishonorable and humiliating bargain, by which, for a mere commercial consideration—the removal of all restriction on Congress to enact navigation laws—they gave twenty years to the African slave traffic unrestricted by national legislation."

The principal bargain of the Convention was the one on this very point of slavery. Two of the principal grievances which the Colonies urged against Great Britain were its Navigation Laws and the forcing the slave trade upon America. Yet the principal conditions of the compact which finally united the States were the reciprocal agreement on the part of the Northern and Southern Colonies to permit the National Government to enact Navigation Laws in the form of a Protective Tariff and to permit the importation of slaves. The bargain was openly made at the time and it is easy to be seen that the Northern Colonies got the best of the bargain, as might have been expected when Yankee traders were pitted against Southern slave owners. Insofar as there was any benefit from the slave trade directly it generally went to the Yankee, while, as was continually pointed out in succeeding years, the tariff was very largely a tax imposed upon the Southern planter to constitute a bounty for the Northern manufacturers.

A. M. Simons.

(To be Continued.)

The Revolutionary Nature of the Socialist Movement

THREE interesting epochs in the story of the world are the English revolution of the seventeenth century, the French Revolution of the eighteenth century, and the approaching World Revolution of the twentieth century. The first saw the extinction of autocratic power among Anglo-Saxons; the second banished feudalism from western civilization; and the third will see the final overthrow of all autocratic, aristocratic and plutocratic forms of government. The distinctive mark of these three epochs is their positive Revolutionary nature. It was the failure of many living at the time of the two former to recognize this that led to much unnecessary war and bloodshed. The transformation from aristocracy to limited monarchy and pseudo-democracy could have taken place peacefully had men so willed. The passing from Capitalism to Socialism needs neither warfare nor bloodshed if enough men and women in time can be made to realize its essentially Revolutionary character.

In the English Revolution Cromwell had to face the struggle between his own faction, who wished to conquer, and the Presbyterians, who but half wished to conquer, and who hated the sectarians in their own ranks more than the common enemy. The aristocratic leaders among the latter became frightened the very moment they saw plainly that the Revolution was going beyond the objects of an aristocracy, and that it was likely to do too much for the people.

Again Cromwell would have saved the king; he would probably have made terms with him, and if he could have trusted him, set him again upon his throne. But Charles the First could not see that he was fallen; his anointed kingship was still fact-proof. He tried to play off one of the two contending parties in the nation against the other. Cromwell discovered his duplicity. Is it to be wondered at that the former's followers should resolve "that it was their duty, if ever the Lord brought them back in peace, to call Charles Stuart, that man of blood, to an account for the blood he has shed and the mischief he had done to his utmost against the Lord's cause and people"?

In the French Revolution there were Mirabeau and Lafayette on the one hand, Robespierre and Danton on the other; there

were the Girondists and the Jacobins; the Mountain and the Moderates. Mirabeau and Lafayette hoped to secure a modified and constitutional monarchy in France, for the French bourgeoisie wanted a king to protect them against the masses, whom they had already begun to fear. Robespierre and Danton wanted a republic. The Girondists represented the burgher classes and were eager to establish a new constitution in all its parts, and especially were they anxious to establish the legality of *lending money out on interest*. While the Jacobins or Mountain, representing the suffering populace, were "eager, defiant, weary of negotiation, suspicious of treason at every point, and zealously determined to push the principles of the Revolution to their limits."

In one of those blunt, vigorous letters ventilating his own position, the king's position, and the position of the country at a time of rapidly approaching financial disaster, Turgot, the great pre-revolutionary economist, used these words of startling prescience: "Do not forget, sire, that it was weakness which placed the head of Charles I. on the block." Thus it is curious how again and again the fate of Charles I. of England is brought warningly, prophetically against Louis XVI of France, for Louis equally distrusted both factions. Like Charles, believing in his anointed kingship, he failed to realize the Revolutionary sentiment of the people and the limit of their demands.

Beyond these social and political revolutions is one far deeper—a revolution which is one day to clothe itself in some new form of power and is to cast the world in a different mould. This the approaching World-Revolution of the twentieth century is foreshadowed by the Socialist movement of today. As men are brought to understand the Revolutionary nature of that movement we can measure in extent the exact degree that Socialism will come in peace or in war.

To some Socialism is merely the pronouncement of a theory of society; to others it is an extension of public ownership, however trifling; again to many it is evolutionary advancement of man and has extended throughout the ages. It seems hardly necessary to say that these definitions are the merest juggling with words, for every class struggle being a political struggle, the Socialist movement is both economic and political and embraces the idea of the ownership of the means of production and distribution by all the people and the means by which the workers are to attain that ownership.

As this is directly opposite to the competitive system, the system of society under which we are living today, it brings us face to face with a Revolutionary proposition so Revolutionary as to constitute a change in human relations so vast as to be almost greater than all the combined changes that have taken place in

human society since the beginning of time. Call yourselves, then, philanthropists, reformers, Fabians, or what you will, but until you fully realize the Revolutionary nature of the Socialist movement, economic and political, do not call yourselves Socialists, for by such perversion of the truth you only deceive yourselves, and by so doing bring harm to a great movement by misleading others.

The point for which I am contending is this that the Socialist movement of today is divided into two factions, viz., those who hope to conquer and those who only partially hope to conquer; those who realize the Revolutionary finality of the movement and those who think that finality so far away as to be some "far off divine event toward which the whole creation moves." The former are the Revolutionary Socialists who are prepared and who are preparing for an immediate "consummation devoutly to be wished." The latter are reformers who as yet are not class conscious and who lack the power of understanding the Revolutionary change intended, and the means by which that change is to be brought about. They use terms without grasping the real meaning and in times of crisis they will be found wanting.

How great is the danger from this misunderstanding of the Revolutionary position may be clearly realized when we learn that in Los Angeles, for instance, may be found twelve different alleged brands of Socialists. Let me enumerate these: (1) There is the Socialist Party, (2) the Socialist Labor Party, (3) the Scientific or Revolutionary Socialist, (4) the Fabian or so-called Evolutionary Socialist, (5) the Christian Socialist, (6) the Church of the Inspired Life Socialist, (7) the Church of the New Era Socialist, (8) the Divine Love Socialist, (9) those in the Republican Party professing Socialism, (10) those in the Democratic Party professing Socialism, (11) those in the Prohibition Party professing Socialism, (12) those Socialists looking to a Union Labor Party for salvation.

If my definition is correct, viz., that every class struggle being a political struggle, Socialism is both economic and political and is an effort on the part of the workers to secure the general ownership of all the means of production and distribution, there must be some error on the part of two-thirds of the above in imagining themselves to be Socialists.

One may belong to all, barring the three capitalistic parties, and still be a Revolutionary Socialist. One can belong to any and not be a Revolutionary Socialist at all, joining the genuine Socialist organization under a misconception. How essential it is then that all true friends of Socialism should understand first the object—and then the method of obtaining that object—of the Socialist movement.

To quote from the Communist manifesto: "All previous his-

torical movements were movements of minorities or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority in the interest of the immense majority. The proletariat cannot stir, cannot raise itself up without the whole superincumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air."

Mark you the Revolutionary tendency here implied. How by any evolutionary process can the whole superincumbent strata of official society be sprung into the air? How by any means short of an intelligent Revolutionary Majority attaining a Revolutionary End by means of the ballot can this be done?

Here, to again quote Marx and Engels: "Of all classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really Revolutionary Class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of modern industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product. The lower middle class, the small manufacturer, the shopkeeper, the artisan, the peasant, all these fight against the bourgeoisie, to save from extinction their existence as fractions of the middle class. They are, therefore, not Revolutionary, but conservative. Nay, more, they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheel of history. If by chance they are Revolutionary, they are so only in view of their impending transfer into the proletariat; they thus defend not their present, but their future interests; they desert their own standpoint to place themselves at that of the proletariat."

Thus we have a Revolutionary Class, a Revolutionary Propaganda, and a Revolutionary Party. A Revolutionary Class exists because economic evils have created it. A Revolutionary Propaganda suggests the only possible remedy of existing conditions. A Revolutionary Political Party is the only method by which a Revolutionary Class can apply a Revolutionary Remedy.

If my reasoning has been sound I have demonstrated the absolute necessity of a Revolutionary political organization. Without such an organization there could be no Socialist movement. Without a Socialist movement Socialism might be likened to that condition to which Christians allude, half in joy and half in sorrow, and which we call the millennium. There is nothing hazy about Socialism like that. What is not real and easily attainable has no place in the Socialist propaganda. Socialism does not promise to create angels, but it will bring about a condition of society in which men and women may become angels if they so desire. To do this many are called but few are chosen. To a Revolutionary principle the chosen must stand fast and without flinching. They must stand side by side with the vast majority of their fellows, without regard to creed or to color, in a Revolutionary Party through which the working class themselves are to achieve their own emancipation.

It might be well for us now to question how nearly the present Socialist Party realizes this Revolutionary Ideal. If we do so we shall find that the party is made up of Revolutionists on the one hand, and of conscious or unconscious reformers on the other. The former know they are to conquer, the latter only partially realize the truth. The former, conversant with Revolutionary economics, can foresee a speedy dissolution of capitalistic society and a Revolutionary finality for the Socialistic movement. The latter, familiar only with capitalistic economics, look to ethical development to cure the gravest social and economic abuses with which the world has yet been faced. The former demand the strictest recognition of the Revolutionary Ideal, the Revolutionary Class, the Revolutionary Propaganda and the Revolutionary Conception of a Socialist Party. The latter look to what they call progress rather than to any strict recognition of this Revolutionary Programme.

Wendell Phillips has told us that revolutions are not made, they come. No Revolutionary Socialist imagines himself to be the creator of revolution. He is simply a forerunner among his fellows in foreseeing a social and economic convulsion, and in foretelling a Revolutionary Remedy. If I am right in believing that the main object of the Socialist political movement is to bring about a peaceful revolution, what relation then has progress to Socialism other than teaching men to prepare for the inevitable?

At some length I have attempted to demonstrate that there is no Socialism that is not Revolutionary Socialism. This I have defined as a Revolutionary Ideal to be attained by a Revolutionary Class, preaching a Revolutionary Propaganda, through the agency of a Revolutionary Party, and by which the workers are to secure the general ownership of all the means of production and distribution for all the people. Let me ask you then what relation has progress to the Socialist movement other than enlarging the number of Class Conscious, Revolutionary, Political, Scientific Socialists?

Hence the main object, I might almost say the sole object of the Socialist Party, is the making of Class Conscious, Revolutionary, Political, Scientific Socialists. The Socialist Party is not merely spreading knowledge as to what Socialism really is; it is in fact only doing this in order that men may realize the importance of the Revolutionary political position. To use scriptural phraseology, the members of the Socialist Party are the salt of the earth. They savor by their Revolutionary distinctiveness. "A little leaven," says St. Paul, "leaveneth the whole lump." The members of the Socialist Party are the minority leaven making light the whole majority. They are indifferent to quantity. Their one desire is quality. With the pitiful failure of

the Christian church, sacrificing principle to wealth and numbers before them, they desire only men who, understanding and recognizing the present class struggle between an exploiting capitalist class on the one hand and an exploited working class on the other, are prepared to work with a Revolutionary Class, in preaching a Revolutionary Propaganda, through a Revolutionary Political Party to attain a Revolutionary End.

Says a former Socialist platform: "We, therefore, call upon the wage-workers of the United States, and upon all other honest citizens, to organize under our banner into a class-conscious body, aware of its rights and determined to conquer them by taking possession of the public powers; so that, held together by an indomitable spirit of solidarity, under the most trying conditions of the present class struggle, we may put a summary end to that barbarous struggle by the abolition of classes, the restoration of the land and of all the means of production, transportation and distribution to the people as a collective body, and the substitution of the Co-operative Commonwealth for the present state of planless production, industrial war and social disorder; a commonwealth in which every worker shall have the free exercise and full benefit of his faculties, multiplied by all the modern factors of civilization."

The only parallel to a Revolutionary class movement such as this is to be found in the Trades Union's movement of the past 150 years. Trades Unionism is the recognition of a class-conscious struggle in a very limited economic sphere. The Socialist movement is the recognition of a class-conscious struggle in an unlimited political sphere. It is the development of Trades Unionism into a world-wide movement of the workers of all nations. It differs from Trades Unionism in this that per se it has nothing whatever to do with anything short of a Revolutionary solution of the labor or industrial problem.

I have purposely used some degree of reiteration to make it clear that a Revolutionary Party organization is an integral part of Socialism just as agitation is an integral part of Christianity, and that a perfect understanding by its members of the object, method and nature of such a Revolutionary organization is necessary to the development and usefulness of the Socialist Party. If this is not recognized and made a fundamental proposition by a considerable majority, if not by all its members, the party is more likely to become like the "leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees," and the movement to utterly fail in the attainment of its object. For just as Christianity is an enthusiasm or it is nothing, Socialism and the Socialist movement are nothing and can produce only a lukewarm and hypocritical expression of social sympathy unless its supporters first, last and all the time, stand in solid phalanx and adhere to the fundamental principle

that they constitute a Revolutionary Class, preaching a Revolutionary Propaganda, through a Revolutionary Political Party in order to attain a Revolutionary End.

We have seen that Socialism and the Socialist movement being one and the same thing constitute a condition, and not a theory; that in other words Socialism is a living fact. We have seen that party organization is as necessary to Socialism as the shell is to the acorn, that without it Socialism cannot exist, nor can men believe, nay we might almost say, disbelieve in its tenets. We have seen that the first and fundamental proposition of Socialism is that a Revolutionary Class is preaching a Revolutionary Propaganda through a Revolutionary Party to attain a Revolutionary End. We have seen that the first object of such a Revolutionary Party is to make Class-Conscious, Revolutionary, Political, Scientific Socialists. It is now necessary to consider how we can best preserve the integrity of this fundamental position.

Here we find that the whole history of the world furnishes us with a constant demonstration that the only method of preserving and propagating an original or fundamental truth in its purity is by delivering or applying it in the most liberal way not incompatible with an uncompromising attachment to its fullest meaning. Once we fully comprehend a principle; once we absolutely refuse to allow anything to stand between us and the recognition of that principle, it really little matters what we do. We cannot consciously do anything in violation of the principle, and hence that which we do cannot by any process of human reasoning be made to support an opposing principle.

Thus providing that the members of the Socialist Party recognize the fundamental principle that they constitute a Revolutionary Class, preaching a Revolutionary Propaganda, through a Revolutionary Party to attain a Revolutionary End, and that they form a Class-Conscious, Clear-Cut, Political, Scientific Body, fighting for Socialism, it hardly matters what line of action is adopted in their methods of work. In fact following the argument I have only just laid down, their every existence as an organization depends on the most liberal methods of work being employed. For unless those who understand and uphold the fundamental Revolutionary Socialist position are prepared to act on the most liberal lines not incompatible with an uncompromising adherence to that principle, we shall actually jeopardize the continued existence of the present Socialist Party.

Hence, just as the repeating of a creed takes from the words any meaning at all, and defeats the very object intended, so a constant, tiresome and unnecessary repetition of the fundamental proposition of Socialism by Socialists, however true it may be, may take all vitality out of a Socialist party. This seems to have

happened in the Socialist Labor Party. Thus only harm, and little if any good can come from turning propaganda meetings into a field for the pronouncement and re-pronouncement of this position; of using business meetings of the party as a vehicle for the same end; and of using the party press having any considerable circulation outside of the party membership for the ventilation of private views for or against the same thing. Differences of opinion among its members are vital to the welfare of the party, and discussion of these differences among themselves are educational, necessary and of great value to the party membership, but only harm can come from airing such differences before an ignorant world.

I am not in favor of, nay I am bitterly opposed to adding members to the party until every reasonable effort has been made to impress upon applicants the Revolutionary position they are endorsing. The party is only seeking trouble by any other course, but after mature consideration I venture the opinion that only good can come and much bad feeling be eliminated by the strictest recognition of the fundamental Revolutionary Principle in the party organization on the one hand, and by the most liberal line of action, not in violation of that principle in lines of propaganda work, on the other.

James T Van Rensselaer.

The Problem of Rapid Transit in Cities

NEW YORK CITY has increased in population 37 per cent in ten years. The causes that make it to the interest of large numbers of people to remove to the cities are in the nature of the business system which offers to them a living in the manufacturing cities which they do not make on the mortgaged farms. There is no doubt that this inconvenient and unnatural congestion of the population in cities is increased by the admitted practice of all transportation companies to "tax the traffic for all it will bear." And this further aggravates the problem of street car service. Apparently our surface cars could not be run very much faster through crowded streets without great danger. This does not apply, however, to the elevated trains. Perhaps, on the existing lines hardly enough cars could be added to comfortably accommodate the people at all times. That there are engineering problems will be admitted. But these engineering problems are created by the present business system. That the people can be comfortably accommodated and pay for such accommodation there is no doubt. The fact is that they are not.

Investors in the stocks of the street railway companies will admit that their investments are governed by their purpose to get the largest possible profits; dividends on their capital. Their profit is the difference between the income and the expenses of the business. They are, consequently, interested in having this difference as large as possible; and the management that is most acceptable to them will be that which can make the expenses as low as possible and the income as large as possible. That is to say, that the men managing the street car service are selected for their ability to supply the public with the cheapest possible service and charge them for it the largest possible price. The cost of running crowded cars is probably very little greater than the cost of running empty cars, or cars only comfortably filled. The motive for building new lines can only be the hope of more profits. Whatever tends to reduce the crowding on cars tends to reduce the profits per car and the rate of interest on stock. It does not seem that incompetence in management could make for the public as bad a state of things as this deliberate intention to give them the poorest service at the largest possible price.

It will be urged that the income does not permit the neces-

sary changes. The low rate of interest on stock will be cited to prove this. It is perfectly well known that the rate of interest on face value of any stock has no meaning whatever to show the rate of profit on investment, unless the capital actually involved in the business is known. Not even the market price of the stock is any guide in determining this, for this market price is in proportion to the anticipated dividends on it, and bears no relation to either previous investment or the capital actually involved in the business. The practice of watering stock is a perfectly commonplace method of concealing large profits and diverting attention from the extortion by which they are accumulated. If the profit for every \$100 actually involved in the business is \$25, the actual rate of interest is 25 per cent. If on this stock of a face value of \$500 is sold, there would be \$5 profit for every hundred of it, and the rate of interest declared would be 5 per cent. Where no dividend on stock is declared at all, it will be found that profits are devoted to payment of interest on bonds, which differ not from the stocks, except in that interest is guaranteed at fixed rate.

There are people in every community who hover between the hope of profit by the present business system and the fear of being crushed by it into the great mass of the working class. The foundation of this business system is the control of the land, machinery and organization necessary for production and trade by the few that they may enjoy the products of the labor of the many. Labor power is purchased at the lowest possible price in the market, the price of his subsistence, and consumed as quickly and thoroughly as possible in making profits, a surplus over and above its wages. This consumption of human life in unwilling, unpaid service for the profit of a few, is the only essential condition of slavery. These people, while as a class the most intelligent in the community, have always been too dull to see this, however clearly shown. There is nothing in their exalted religious beliefs that is offended by it. They have no moral sense that revolts against it. But, when hopes of profits are overbalanced by immediate losses and inconvenience by this business system, when the large combinations of capital, the trusts, practice successfully on them that which they do not succeed in practicing on others, they are marvelously enlightened; whereas, no power of logic or eloquence could before convince them of the iniquity of this business system. Planks appear in the platforms of that political party which is most devoted to the interest of this class calling for the national ownership of coal mines and railroads, and for the municipal ownership of public utilities. The business of purchasing labor power at the lowest market price and consuming it to pay interest on bonds rather than stocks, is to be transferred to the state. This is a state capitalism, commonly called state socialism or public ownership.

This change must extend the opportunities for political corruption as it extends the power of public officers to control of industries, and without affecting the causes of political corruption. We do not want municipal ownership of anything until we first secure public ownership of the municipality. Corruption of public officers is common in all states of society in which the wealth produced by the people is accumulated through various processes, always legal, of course, by others controlling the industries of the people. There is no substantial difference in their appropriation of profit interest and rent as the holders of bonds rather than of stocks. Such a wealth owning class always has profits to make out of the people and are certain to use all means in their power to control public affairs in their own interest against the interest of the people. How can purity in public affairs be sustained on a business system that is founded on stealing? The moral and material effects are not changed by the fact that it is not commonly called by that name. How can a political republic be sustained in industrial despotism?

The costs of running a successful business are always a part of the income, the profit being the other part. If this profit is abolished and the price to the public is made the cost of the service, or product, the price must be less. If not, the incompetence or dishonesty of the management is proven, conditions being the same. It is only fair to admit that the dishonesty of capitalist politicians is no worse than their incompetency in such affairs. However, the Fourteenth Annual Report of the United States Commissioner of Labor on Water, Gas and Electric Light Plants shows that municipally controlled plants do supply the public at lower rates. If it did not, nothing would be established against the contentions of Socialists, as these plants are, with very few exceptions, burdened with bonded indebtedness, and the interest on these city bonds is charged to the cost of production. But if it is pointed out, for instance, that the cost of running the Government Bureau of Engraving and Printing is so great that private capitalists can contract to do the work for less and yet make a profit, this only illustrates that the private capitalist, impelled by his selfish interest, is far more successful in wringing out unpaid labor from employees than is the capitalist politician, impelled by his zeal for the public economy. This fact is not questioned. As a system for getting labor unpaid, this present one can hardly be improved by transferring its management to the state.

If the public do not like to be herded like cattle into the cars, why do they persist in offering honor and great rewards to men who do this most successfully? But what solution is proposed to the problem of rapid transit in cities? It seems safe to say that the service will not be run for the benefit of the public until it

comes completely into the control of the public. Are we going to leave the negotiation of this transfer for us to agents and friends of the present owners of the street railways? And is it to be expected that the representatives of the people will be generally true to their trust left to shift for themselves against the capitalist interests they antagonize, and while the means of corruption is in the hands of these capitalists, having great incentives to use it? As for the work people, whatever the changes in fares or wages or prices, they may expect no more than the bare price of a living while their insufficient opportunities of employment are limited by the chances of profit for those who command the means of employment.

W. A.

The Kischiniff Massacres

To the Laborers of All Countries:

THE press has brought news of the massacres of Kischineff. For two days robbery, murder and abominable atrocities were committed without the Russian authority or its legal agents, so prompt at intervention when it comes to an uprising of workingmen, or students, or when it is a question of confiscating the liberties of the people of Finland, doing anything whatever to protect these unhappy people, whose only crime is that they are Jews.

No one familiar with the proceedings of the government of Nicholas II. can fail to see in these unhappy events an attempt at intimidation and at the same time a vengeance against the Jews for the revolutionary action of the Jewish proletariat in Russia.

Russian absolutism seeks to stir up race and religious hatred to appease the general discontent and to obtain a pretext for drowning in blood a population which, struggling for its own liberty, threatens the existence of the government.

We appeal to all laborers and to all honorable people against this odious policy.

Deeply moved at the thought of the victims who have fallen under the blows of the agents of the Czar, stirred with rebellion at the thought of these execrable acts, we address to the civilized world one last appeal in the hope of preventing the renewal of these outrages.

We also would give warning of new scenes of slaughter which are impending. In Southern Russia, in Poland and in Lithuania, regions where the Jewish population is very dense, it is feared that the events of Kischineff will be reproduced.

WORKINGMEN! if governments will neither speak nor act, do you speak and act! If there remain in governments no more pity, nor human sentiments, make your protest heard and express your indignation!

WORKINGMEN! Your silence would be a crime, for it is not against a race or a religion that Czarism is directing its blows, it is above all against a class! This government is aiming at the extermination of the class-conscious proletariat!

Speak, agitate for yourself! Let your voices rise to denounce these crimes against humanity. Let your memory preserve the martyrs of the people.

*International Socialist Bureau,
V. Serwy, Secretary.*

1448 Campbell

EDITORIAL

The Reward of Labor

We publish in this number an article by Comrade Raphael Buck on the subject of the "Remuneration of Labor in the Co-operative Commonwealth," which deals with what the opponents of Socialism, and evidently many Socialists, consider a very important, if not a pressing, problem. Because of the importance with which this problem is usually considered and because of the fact that the writer has summed up the prevailing idea of the problem in very good form, we are very glad to give it space. At the same time it is our opinion that the problem which he postulates is really unimportant and that the solution which he offers is by no means a probable one.

He states that there are two ideas concerning the method of remuneration, one of payment according to labor time, and the other of perfect equality. We would at once say that there was another solution, and one much more important than either of these, and that is the one which will find the principal reward for labor in the labor itself. The idea of the painfulness of labor is something which is inseparably connected with exploitation and which does not necessarily belong to any system where exploitation is unknown. At the present time we exert our strength, both physical and intellectual, to do something we do not like in order to get the opportunity to exert that strength upon something which we do like. But modern psychology, physiology and pedagogy all agree that nothing is more pleasurable to the normal individual than some constructive occupation. Hence it is that all schemes relating to future society which aims to find "its incentive to labor" in some form of financial reward, aside from the labor itself, are laboring under the influence of the *Zeitgeist* of capitalism.

The only way by which we can determine the form of future institutions is by studying present tendencies. The tendencies on this point are along two lines, one of which, so hampered by the environment of present society as to be ordinarily unnoticed, is the tendency represented in the Arts and Crafts movement to make labor so pleasurable as to constitute its own reward.

The second tendency, which is almost equally hampered, is the one which tends to furnish universal basic necessities equally and without cost to all. We see this last tendency in the furnishing of water and public lighting, care of the streets, etc., in our great cities. There is no doubt but what this line of development would be greatly accelerated by a co-operative organization of society. Not only transportation and the use

of the instruments of communication would be furnished absolutely free, but there is every reason to believe that such a society would find it advisable to furnish a certain amount of the fundamental necessities of food, clothing and shelter without limit or cost to each individual. Once that the race was lifted above the swinish level of our present society there is every reason to believe that such gratuitous distribution would be accompanied with much less waste and much greater economy than would be true if any attempt at the keeping of individual accounts was made.

Another error which runs through the article, and which is closely related to the other two, is the exaggerated importance and false idea of the struggle for survival. Kropotkin's "Mutual Aid" has so thoroughly exploded this old crude idea, which in reality was never held either by Darwin, to whom it is ordinarily imputed, or to any of the really great expounders of the doctrine of evolution, with the possible exception of Huxley, that it is scarcely worth while to discuss it further here. The struggle for survival does not by any means necessarily have to take place on a purely physical basis, or rather the struggle may express itself on a physical basis when it takes place in the intellectual world. Space is too limited here for me to go further into this idea, had I even the biological knowledge which is necessary to do so.

The problem of the incentive to labor is purely a psychological one and turns entirely upon the question of what are the motives of human action? At the present time it is undoubtedly true that the main motive which drives men to work is fear of want and desire to gratify certain pleasurable emotions. It is certain that under co-operative ownership and operation of industry hunger as a driving force will no longer exist. Once, however, that each person is guaranteed an existence with reasonably short hours of labor, the overwhelming importance as to attractiveness will be placed upon the character of the work itself. Slightly shortening the hours, as Bellamy suggests, would be ridiculous if the work was made pleasurable instead of painful. Indeed, it is highly probable that Bellamy is largely responsible for this wholly wrong point of view, and he was so considered by William Morris, who must always be considered the main exponent of the correct position.

The incentive to labor under Socialism must be found, not in some external force which will drive the laborer to his work, but in the inherent attractiveness of the work itself. The social energies will necessarily be concentrated on the problem of removing the disagreeable features from toil. Any one who knows something of the spirit of craftsmanship as it has already existed at different times on the face of the earth, and who is in any degree familiar with modern psychology, will at once admit that this problem is really so slight as to be insignificant. William Morris has well satirized it in his "News from Nowhere," where he has the people going about quarreling good-naturedly with one another over who shall have a chance to do the work.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

The big strikes in New York, Chicago, Pittsburg, Denver and Omaha are pretty conclusive proof that employers are organizing all along the line and that Mr. David M. Parry, and not Senator M. A. Hanna, expresses the real sentiments of the employing class. In New York the half-billion dollar combine that locked out over one hundred thousand men succeeded in splitting the building crafts and is using one faction to beat the brains out of the other and abolish sympathy strikes by forcing contracts with individual unions. In Chicago the employers' combines are also playing the game of separating the organized workers by securing contracts abolishing the sympathy strike and forcing unionists to work with and support scabs, while the arbitration schemes have in nearly every case proven disappointments to the unions. In Denver, where the bosses started to smash the unions, a settlement was made that all unionists were to go back to work without discrimination and troubles arbitrated. Now it is reported that the capitalists are deliberately violating their agreements and a farce is being made of arbitration. In other cities, including many small places, the unions are confronted by employers' combines that display an autocratic and tyrannical spirit, violate agreements if they see fit, and arbitrate only when they are forced to do so. The effect of all these bitter strikes and lockouts is that the workers are being taught there is a class struggle despite the maudlin twaddle of the Hannaites about "harmonizing" labor and capital and that Parryism is not accepted by the employers. Hanna may fool all of the people some of the time, some people all the time, but he won't fool all the people all the time. In fact, Hanna stock has begun to decline, and if it is given a chance on the so-called labor market much longer it will go to zero.

The National Civic Federation has established a monthly, and the last issue contains a symposium on the question of incorporation of trade unions, being the views of prominent men among the laboring people, the capitalists and "the public." The *Review* summarizes the article as follows: "The symposium as a whole seems to indicate that the customary arguments for and against incorporation of trade unions are invalid, since they turn on the responsibility of unions for unlawful acts. Incorporation would not increase nor decrease their responsibility in this respect. Both the treasury of the union and the property of the union and the property of the members are liable in damage on account of such acts, whether the union is incorporated or unincorporated." It is well for the unions to take cognizance of the foregoing statement, coming, as it does, from an organ that is published for the purpose of educating them into the belief that the interests of capitalism and labor are identical. The "unlawful acts" of unions constitute striking, picketing, boycotting and diso-

beying injunctions, and, if the organizations and members can be sued on account of such acts, it looks as though labor will be compelled to vote. Striking, boycotting and picketing at the ballot-box is not yet unlawful.

There is little or no change in the struggle between the industrialists and autonomists for mastery. The action of the machinists in changing from craft autonomy to the industrialist side and claiming jurisdiction over all workers in machine shops has caused much comment in trade union circles. The crafts menaced by the machinists are making vigorous resistance, and demands are being made that the I. A. of M. be expelled from the A. F. of L. for alleged violation of laws and charter rights. They will be plucked to pieces by the larger organizations. The carpenters—There are several unions in the metal working trades that are fearful that woodworkers' controversy is no nearer settlement, nor is the fight between the brewery workers and engineers and firemen, or the troubles between some of the minor organizations. If the tailors vote favorably at their referendum to claim jurisdiction over the special order workers, who are now largely controlled by the garment workers, it will mean a brand new fight and one that will be bitterly waged. Most of the time of the A. F. of L. executive board at the recent Toronto session was given up to the consideration of jurisdiction claims without much of importance having been accomplished. Most of the grievances will be carried into the Boston convention of the A. F. of L., and it is quite likely that some decided stand will be taken in favor of either broad industrialism or the old, narrow autonomy principle, as the organizations interested are becoming tired of the present uncertainty where they are unable to depend upon closely affiliated bodies in case of trouble with the organized employers.

Damage suits against unionists for engaging in strikes, picketing, boycotting, etc., are coming thick and fast. Following the successful suit in Rutland, Vt., where the machinists were assessed \$2,500, and the cases in Dayton and Waterbury, Conn., the bookbinders of Chicago are sued for \$30,000, the metal polishers, brassworkers and electrical workers in the same city for \$30,000, the garment workers in Racine, Wis., for \$10,000, and union girls that struck against the Kellogg Switchboard & Supply Company in Chicago for a total of \$42,000. National officers and official journals are becoming quite disturbed at this new turn of affairs, and except in a few instances there is a distinct impression taking root that political action must be taken to meet the new danger. Those who oppose political action offer no remedy for the evil, but content themselves with denunciation and claims that damage suits are unfair, unjust, etc. If the pessimists would agitate the proposition of placing class-conscious labor men in legislatures and on the bench they would be doing something practical to meet the attacks of capital.

The National Association of Manufacturers is going to establish a strike insurance company, and it is confidently asserted that fully \$100,000,000 will be behind the venture. Some of the prominent Wall Street capitalists are said to be willing to support such a company. The subject was generally discussed in the New Orleans convention of the N. A. of M., and it is claimed that a strike insurance company is no more impracticable than

a tornado or accident or marine disaster insurance company, and that there is about the same facility for determining the risks. The plan is for the employer or policy holder to receive a payment of the amount of profit he would have made had his plant not been suspended by the strike. He is to be paid every day that the suspension of business lasts. This will be following a system on a large and general scale that is already in operation in some trades. Trade unionists who imagine that Mr. Parry and his colleagues have merely organized to give pink teas or chowder parties will find that they are sadly misinformed. Mr. Parry and his fellow employers have combined for the purpose of harmonizing capital and labor, and they are going after labor with a club and will beat harmony into it. While Hanna and his crowd are getting a lot more advertising in the newspapers than the Parryites, still the latter are doing things that will have an important bearing on the history of organized labor, and trade unionists who have not been harmonized will do well to bear that fact in mind.

The American Labor Union has concluded its national convention, but to the disappointment of many active trade unionists took no action looking toward combining with the A. F. of L. The A. L. U. has enjoyed great growth during the past year. The membership has increased from 18,000 direct and 70,000 affiliated members in 1892 to 70,000 direct and 200,000 affiliated members in 1903. The Western Federation of Miners, in session in Denver at the same time, also showed splendid progress, and now has 75,000 members and \$3,000,000 in the treasury, and is financially perhaps the strongest union in the country. Both organizations reaffirmed their belief in the doctrine of Socialism. The International Association of Machinists, in their Milwaukee convention, also adopted a resolution in favor of political action along class-conscious lines for collective ownership. The Ladies' Garment Workers' International Union, in Cleveland, declared in favor of Socialism and the Socialist party, while the International Printing Pressmen's Union, in Cincinnati, declared in favor of putting up a candidate for president from the ranks of the workers. The Minnesota State Federation of Labor endorsed Socialism and referred the issue to a referendum of affiliated locals. In the Iowa State Federation a Socialist resolution was defeated, but it is claimed that a majority of the delegates were Socialists and merely hesitated to commit the organization to that principle as a matter of policy. Altogether satisfactory progress is being made.

One of the incidents during the past month which created considerable comment was the action of John C. Havemeyer, of sugar trust fame, in challenging the trade unions to publicly answer sixteen questions that he propounded, Havemeyer agreeing to hire the opera house in Yonkers to give the labor representatives the opportunity to reply. While Havemeyer's attack was loudly applauded by the capitalist press from one end of the country to the other, the papers made no mention of the fact that the sugar king's bluff was quickly accepted, and Ben Hanford, the well-known printer and Socialist orator, was invited to make the principal address. Hanford literally flayed Havemeyer and forced the latter to defend himself by a hypocritical endorsement of "good" unions as distinguished from the wicked Socialistic organization that aim to divorce the patriotic trust magnates from their class privileges. The incident goes to show that the shrewd plutocrats, when driven into a corner by the logic

of the Socialists, will aim to save their bacon by appealing for sympathy from non-socialist union people. This is the game that is being played at present by the National Economic League and various national organizations of capitalists which are bribing a few renegades to sow seeds of discord in the trade union movement by singling out Socialism as an object of attack. These creatures, of course, do not attack Republicans or Democrats or their political principles, proving that they are the paid hirelings of those who thrive and wax fat through the operation of the profit-mongering system. Union men and women will do well to consider, when they read attacks on Socialism in the labor press or daily newspapers, that there are combinations of millionaires that pay liberally for such stuff that is meant to divide the workers and enable the capitalistic labor skimmers to continue to exploit the toilers and enjoy prosperity at labor's expense.

Quite naturally the American Socialists are greatly enthused and encouraged by the tremendous gains of their comrades in Germany and Denmark. And on this side of the water the movement is going forward at an accelerated pace. State conventions of the Socialist party are being held and tickets nominated for the fall elections and the campaign is getting in full swing. The national office has half a dozen speakers and organizers in the field, while the various state organizations are also sending out men to build up the party, and local speakers and organizers everywhere are reported as displaying unusual activity. Nearly every week a new party paper enters the field and the number of trade union papers that are endorsing the principles of Socialism and aiding the Socialist party is becoming legion. Hardly a national or state convention is held by trade unionists nowadays that the subject of Socialism is not discussed and in some cases endorsed. The sporadic labor party movement that for a time threatened to stem the tide has had no appreciable effect and seems to be disappearing. In some localities of the extreme West it is reported that local labor parties have gone over to the Socialist party in a body or intend to do so. Another danger that threatened for a time was that of sectionalism, which has always been a source of amusement to Socialists when they contemplated the rows in the capitalist parties that were traceable to this cause. But this narrow and absurd "issue" has about run its course. In the near future the national office intends to send representative Eastern men into the West and Western men into the East to bring the different sections of the country into closer touch with each other, and quite likely this fool question will receive its quietus for all time to come. Just as the growing child is afflicted with the mumps and measles, so a new political movement is bound to be more or less annoyed by these petty disagreements, and, while they may appear unfortunate, at the same time they are a sure indication that the movement is very much alive and really moving.

No sooner are the window glass workers displaced by a machine when another branch of the trade is hard hit. After many months of ceaseless experimenting, Ball Bros., of Muncie, Ind., have completed an automatic machine which, it is claimed, will soon be the means of throwing every white liner glass presser in the country out of employment. The machine is an automatic cutter and presser, and does away entirely with the presser

and leaves but one man to operate the entire machine. About one hundred men will be thrown out of work in Ball Bros.' plant, and four other concerns have already applied for the new device. Boys will run the new machines. An experiment that may also revolutionize the iron and steel industry of the country and displace thousands of miners and metal workers was successful in the plant of the Valley Iron Company, in St. Paul. Titanic ore, of which there are billions of tons in Northern Minnesota, was smelted in an ordinary cupola and turned out pig iron, which polished up like steel, and which, according to those interested in the experiment, is better than the finest Bessemer steel. It is thought that if the new discovery is entirely successful many ore mines will be abandoned and millions of dollars will be saved to the mill barons. The machinery problem—the question of cheaper production—is bound to become a greater issue to skilled mechanics as well as so-called common laborers each year.

In addition to shutting its mills in Connecticut, the cotton duck trust has closed its Phoenix, Laurel, Franklinville and Mount Pleasant mills in Maryland and will turn out all its products in its Alabama and South Carolina mills, where it can produce cheaper because it can use child labor. The trust controls practically all the cotton duck plants in the country. On the other hand, the Southern legislatures, controlled by the "workingmen's friends," the Democratic party, regularly defeat the child labor bills or pass them in such loose form that they can be declared unconstitutional by the courts without shedding a hair. And yet that old Bourbon party pretends to be opposed to trusts and is begging for the labor vote this year, next year, and all other years.

The readers of the REVIEW will remember that several months ago attention was called to the amendment to the immigration law that was being considered by Congress and that it had the full endorsement of Mr. Frank P. Sargent, immigration commissioner and ex-chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen. The amendment, which was passed by Congress, reads that skilled labor may be imported if like kind unemployed cannot be found in this country. Now Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Taylor rules "that under this clause the only necessary preliminary to the importation of contract labor in any particular trade is a showing beyond reasonable doubt that there is a scarcity of such labor in this country." Mr. Taylor's ruling opens the door to the importation of foreign lace workers. Next thing perhaps some plumber boss or building contractor can step up and say there are no skilled men to be had and import foreign laborers. There would be no cause to complain of the importation of workers if Morgan, Rockefeller & Co. did not have the country's natural opportunities largely monopolized and refuse to allow labor access to the same without paying tribute. If there were no profits to pay to idlers—if there were no millions to be piled up for plutocrats—North America could support a billion population, and every new laborer would mean the further enrichment of the commonwealth, just as was the case in the early days before monopoly reared its ugly head. But to-day every new shipload of workers means more competition for jobs, and where an industrial depression sets in the struggle becomes so fierce that wages naturally drop to the starvation level. It is a pity that workingmen allow officeholders to play fast and loose with questions that have such vital effect upon their welfare and endorse their every act with their ballots.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

Russia

All the world has been startled by the massacres of Kischineff, but very few of the capitalist papers have dared to tell the truth, that this was simply one more move on the part of the policy of violent suppression of Socialism by the Russian government. The *Iskra* (the Spark), the organ of the Russian Social Democrats, published in London, has a long account of the event, which it sums up by saying:

"The government of Nicholas the Foolish plays its last card: It tries to stifle the fast ripening consciousness of the Russian proletariat by poisoning it with the venom of racial hatred and religious fanaticism. The Russian government, through its criminal action in the Kisheneff disorders, virtually says to us Social Democrats: 'You wish to waken the people, you strive to make it the mightiest factor of Russia's future historical development. Very well. You may arouse the masses, but know that their awakening will not be pleasant to you; remember that the masses are like a bloodthirsty wild beast, and when that beast is released from its chains it mercilessly mangles all who surround it, making no difference between friend or foe, the right or the wrong. You say to the masses: "Workingmen of all countries, unite!" But racial hatred will arise in their midst and the Russian workingman will begin to fight his own comrade provided he is of another race or creed. You wish to rouse the masses. Look at its bloody deeds and acknowledge the foolhardiness of your scheme.'"

Meantime the word comes of more and more Socialist activity throughout Russia. The following item taken from the *Volkszeitung* of Vienna is but one of many which gives a picture of what is going on throughout the Russian empire. Speaking of the proposed demonstrations of the workers at Rostow it says: "In the evening a battalion of infantry and a division of Cossacks stood ready to maintain order. The leaders of the Social Democratic party sought to agitate among the people, but without result. Many wounded were carried away."

These few lines from capitalistic sources contain a picture of something of the sufferings by the Socialist comrades in the Russian empire.

Algeria

Constantly the propaganda of Socialism and organization of the workers extend to new fields. *Le Petit Republicque* tells of the growth of the movement in Algeria. In 1889 the Socialists first entered into the electoral

struggle in that country and two papers were established, which, however, only lived a short time. In 1899 Edmond Claris again took up the work of organization, and in October, 1900, a Socialist party was organized and active propaganda was carried on, and on the 18th of March, 1901, more than 200 Socialists celebrated the anniversary of the Commune. Later a congress was held at Mustapha, where twenty-two local organizations were represented. In the legislative elections of 1902 the party supported M. Colin, and on the 8th of February of the same year the first number of *Le Socialiste Algerien* appeared, which quickly attained a circulation of 7,200.

Poland

The following facts are taken from an article by S. Karski in *Justice*. There was no strongly organized party in Poland until 1893, when several different Socialist groups united into one Polish Socialist Party. As there is in Russian Poland neither freedom of speech nor of press, the propaganda is necessarily secret. The literature circulated in Poland from abroad proved insufficient to meet the needs and a secret paper *Robotnik* (Worker) was started in 1894. In the last nine years fifty issues of this paper have appeared. By the same press *Gornik* (Miner) is published for the workers of the mining district. A clandestine journal in Yiddish, a monthly quarterly and scientific paper, a Yiddish quarterly and a Lithuanian paper are among the other publications issued by the Polish Socialists. The following statistics give some idea of the "social cost" of working for Socialism in Poland:

In the year 1895, 42 comrades were committed for ten years of hard labor, 13½ years of prison, 77 years of exile to Siberia, 41 years of Northern Russia, 13 years of exile from Poland.

In the year 1896, 111 comrades for 48 years of hard labor, 15 years of prison, 132 years of exile to Siberia, 29 years of Northern Russia, 194 years of common exile.

In the year 1897, 54 comrades for seven years of prison, 87 years of exile to Siberia, 18 years of Northern Russia, 66 years of common exile.

In the year 1900, 9 comrades were condemned to death, which sentence afterwards was commuted to hard labor in Siberia, each individual from 10 to 20 years. In that year about 200 comrades have been condemned to various terms of prison and exile to Siberia and Russia.

From among the prisoners but few were able to escape from, or on the way to, Siberia. To this small knot of lucky individuals belong two out of four persons arrested in connection with the clandestine press of *Robotnik*.

Italy

The Czar recently declared his intention to visit Italy and the Italian Socialists notified the government that in case he did so he would be hissed in the streets, and that in general they would prepare a hostile demonstration for him. Under these conditions the Czar concluded to postpone his visit.

Denmark

The recent universal elections for the Lower House of the Danish Parliament resulted in the election of sixteen Socialist members. The

finance minister, Hage, was defeated by Socialist Schmidt. The new Chamber is composed of 74 members of the Left, 16 Social Democrats, 12 members of the Right and 11 Moderate Liberals.

Germany

The returns from Germany are still too incomplete for us to write them up at any length. In our next number we shall give a full account of the election, the method of organization of the German Social Democracy, methods of campaigning and comparative results. Suffice it to say that the latest information shows that the vote is about 3,008,000, with 81 members of the Reichstag.

Thirty Years' Growth.

The following table shows the progress of the Social Democratic Party in the eleven Reichstag elections, beginning in 1871:

<i>Year.</i>	<i>Popular Vote.</i>	<i>Members.</i>
1871	124,655	2
1874	351,952	9
1877	493,288	12
1878	437,158	9
1881	311,961	12
1884	549,990	24
1887	763,128	11
1890	1,427,298	35
1893	1,876,738	44
1898	2,113,073	56
1903	3,008,000	81

BOOK REVIEWS

Pure Sociology. By Lester F. Ward. The Macmillan Co. Cloth, Quarto, 607 pp. \$4.

Whatever any one may think of the conclusions of this book, there is no denying the fact that it is one of the most fundamental studies of social facts and forces that has ever been published. The author defines Pure Sociology as "a treatment of the phenomena and laws of society as it is, an explanation of the processes by which social phenomena take place, a search for the antecedent conditions by which the observed facts have been brought into existence, and an ætiological diagnosis that shall reach back as far as the state of human knowledge will permit into the psychologic, biologic and cosmic causes of the existing social state of man. But it must be a pure diagnosis, and all therapeutic treatment is rigidly excluded. All ethical considerations, in however wide a sense that expression may be understood, must be ignored for the time being, and attention concentrated upon the effort to determine what actually is. Pure sociology has no concern with what society *ought* to be, or with any social ideals. It confines itself strictly with the present and the past, allowing the future to take care of itself. It totally ignores the purpose of the science, and aims at truth wholly for its own sake." The "subject matter" of sociology is "*human achievement*; it is not what men are, but what they do; it is not the structure, but the functions." Achievement in turn he defines as the transformation of the environment, and points out that this is peculiar to man.

The study of the materials of human society will include a study of forces. He finds that achievement only results from added increments. "Achievement does not consist in wealth. Wealth is fleeting and ephemeral. Achievement is permanent and eternal. And now mark the paradox. Wealth, the transient, is material; achievement, the enduring, is immaterial. The products of achievement are not material things at all. As said before, they are not ends but means. They are methods, ways, principles, devices, arts, systems, institutions. In a word, they are *inventions*." Again he points out, on page 34: "It must be clear from all that has been said that the essential characteristic of all achievement is some form of *knowledge*. But knowledge, unlike capacity, cannot be transmitted through heredity. The germ-plasm can only carry the ancestral strains of parents to their offspring and descendants, and whether 'acquired characters' can be thus transmitted or not, it is certain that acquired knowledge is a 'character' that does not descend in that way. The process by which achievement is handed down may be aptly called *social heredity*. This social heredity is the same thing that I have otherwise denominated social development in which there has been no break in

the transmission of achievement. We thus have the continuity of the social germ-plasm, which is as good an analogy as the organicists have discovered. The social germ-plasm is that Promethean fire which has been passed on from age to age, warming the world into life with its glow, and lighting it with its flame through all the long night of the past into the daybreak of the present." In this desire to contribute to the social germ-plasm he finds one of the greatest incentives to exertion. "Thus far only a few have contributed to this stream, but the percentage is probably increasing, and might under improved social conditions be greatly increased, and the time may come when all may at least aspire to the honor of laying some small offering on the altar of civilization. As the ages go by and history records the results of human action it becomes clear to larger numbers that this is the true goal of life, and larger numbers seek it. It is seen that only those who have achieved are remembered, that the memory of such grows brighter instead of dimmer with time, and that these names are likely to be kept fresh in the minds of men forever. Achievement, therefore, comes to constitute a form of immortality and has exceedingly attractive sides. This hope of immortality has doubtless formed one of the important motives in all ages, but as the hope of a personal immortality wanes under the glare of scientific truth, especially of biological truth, there is likely to be a still stronger tendency in this direction."

In the discussion of methodology he declares that "It is the function of methodology in social science to classify social phenomena in such a manner that the groups may be brought under uniform laws and treated by exact methods. Sociology then becomes an exact science. In doing this, too, it will be found that we have passed from chaos to cosmos. Human history presents a chaos. The only science that can convert the milky way of history into a definite social universe is sociology, and this can only be done by the use of an appropriate method, by using the data furnished by all the special social sciences, including the great scientific trunks of psychology, biology and cosmology, and generalizing and co-ordinating the facts and groups of facts until unity is attained." He follows this idea into almost too great detail, and one sometimes wonders if it is really necessary to trace everything back through all its biological history to the original homogeneity.

Sociology cannot be a science unless it has its own peculiar field of facts and forces, and it is the description of these which constitutes the greater portion of this book. He decides that "the social forces are psychic, and hence sociology must have a psychologic basis. He finds that this basis arises from the development of feeling. The organism pursues feeling without regard to results. But the basis of selection orders matter so that only those feelings remain enjoyable which contribute to the formation of advantageous functions. Once that feeling had reached this point, it gave birth to *interest*. The creature was then interested in gratifying those feelings which performed functions valuable to the race. From this time on interest became the great dynamic feature of social evolution. The author traces the biologic origin of all social forces and formulates a scientific classification of all sociological material which cannot fail to be of great value to future workers in this field even though it may in time be subjected to great alterations. In tracing the origin of human institutions he shows that the first great essential in race evolution was social assimilation, from which there resulted a definite social body suffi-

ciently large to partially control environment. This took place long before historic times. Then followed a differentiation during which various races developed.

Once races had been developed and had spread over a large portion of the earth they soon came in contact with one another, and then began the process of social integration. The first step in this was a struggle of races, followed by conquest and subjection, after which there followed caste and a gradual mitigation of this condition, leaving a state of great individual, social and political inequality, to be succeeded by purely military subjection with the forms of law and idea of legal right; then the state, under which arose a more or less homogeneous people, which in turn soon gave birth to the sentiment of patriotism and led to the formation of nations, that being the condition in which societies of to-day are found.

In his discussion of social dynamics he treats more elaborately of the forms of social change. Part III of the book "Telesis" discusses the various forms of social control which can be used to secure a purposeful evolution. This portion of the book also is filled with a mass of valuable thoughts and facts most suggestive to social students.

His discussion of the evolution of the social relations of the sexes is extremely striking and interesting. From biological analogy he shows that the female represents the stable racial element in society and that the transition to male domination in selection represented a great evolutionary change which resulted in the apparent superiority of man at the present time. He also expresses the opinion that with the disappearance of the economic domination of man a new stage will probably arise in which neither sex will occupy this controlling position, but where the selection will be mutual.

He seems to a large degree to accept the materialistic interpretation of history and the socialist philosophy of institutions, but owing to the narrowness with which he confines himself to the purely descriptive field there is little bearing upon what are commonly called practical problems.

The work is one of those great fundamental things which must be read again and again and which, once mastered, will constitute a starting point for countless lines of thought.

History of the French Revolution. C. L. James. Published by Abe Isaak Jr. Cloth, 343 pp. \$1.

We have had histories of the French Revolution from almost every point of view, but this is the only one which seems to definitely proceed from the point of view of the mob. Since the mob, however, was really one of the most important parties, if not the most important one, concerned, there is much excuse for this point of view.

The work opens with a very good summary of the conditions which led up to the French Revolution, and in the discussion of events it offers very little that is new. It seems to have the one defect which is perhaps inseparable from almost all histories of the French Revolution, that of being overwhelmed by the vast number of details.

The author tells us that shortly after the fall of the Bastille "France, having reached the climax of anarchy, was rapidly settling down to peace and quietness. An unprecedented spirit of harmony and tranquillity, normal fruits of complete anarchy, prevailed on the whole for many

months." Again, he states that "from the spring of 1790 to autumn of 1791 France was as near as any great nation ever has been to having no government at all. Nor was it very different between September, 1792, and March, 1793. There was, indeed, a king who exercised some power from September, 1791, to August, 1792, and a legislature. But these co-ordinating branches blocked each other's wheels so effectually that anarchy on the whole continued."

For these particular periods the author has, as naturally might be expected, the greatest praise. For the most of the leaders of the Revolution he has only the greatest denunciation. Only for Marat, for Condorcet, and Danton, whom he designates as "the best champion of freedom which the crisis of his time produced," does he have any praise. In his summary he declares "That such another revolution impends will be doubted by no one who has studied history in the light of evolution." However, he offers no evidence other than this bare assertion of the coming of such social change. Although he seems to be full of praise for the epoch as a whole, nevertheless one is by no means satisfied that he has proven the desirability of that method of social development.

Taken as a whole, the work is a fairly good summary of the history of the period discussed, and seems to be as nearly impartial as a work written from such a plainly biased point of view could be.

When one comes to examine his bibliography he is struck rather with the things omitted than those included. He seems never to have heard of the writings of Belfort Bax, whose work on Marat should certainly not be ignored by any one writing on this subject, and especially one who claims to represent proletarian interests. Still more remarkable is the fact that he does not include any of the works of Morse Stephens, while he does include many things whose connection with the subject it is rather hard to see.

As usual, there have been a large number of propaganda pamphlets received during the month. Comrade Bigelow's pamphlet on "The Capitalist Farmer and the Socialist Wageworker," while not really advancing anything new, yet says what it has to say in clear, simple English that will make it of great value in the particular field for which it is intended. Price, 10 cents.

Another pamphlet which, while it is not without intrinsic value as a statement of socialism, is more noticeable because of its authorship. It is "What to Do and How to Do It, or Socialism vs. Capitalism," by Rev. G. W. Woodbey, "Negro Socialist Orator." "This little book is dedicated to that class of citizens who desire to know what the Socialists want to do and how they propose to do it. By one who was once a chattel slave, freed by the proclamation of Lincoln, and now wishes to be free from the slavery of capitalism."

This book is for sale by the author, 709 Twelfth street, San Diego, Cal. Price, 10 cents.

Charles Lincoln Phifer sends out from the press of *The Coming Nation* a little booklet which he calls "Pictures of the Co-operative Commonwealth," which contains considerable of interest on this ever fascinating subject, and probably his guesses are as good as those of anyone else.

It is written in striking, catchy style and will undoubtedly prove of value in propaganda work.

Charles H. Kerr & Co. issue another number of their Pocket Library entitled "Easy Lessons in Socialism," by William H. Leffingwell, which adds one more to the list of good elementary works to be handed to the beginner. The form of the work, by which a series of propositions are explained in a series of lessons with very simple language, makes it something different and more valuable than most of the works along this line. Price, 5 cents.

The *New Time*, of Spokane, Wash., publishes a neat little 10-cent pamphlet by John Mackenzie on "Panics," which sets forth the Marxian explanation of these industrial disturbances in a clear and interesting form.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

New Numbers of the Pocket Library

Most readers of the International Socialist Review are already familiar with the Pocket Library of Socialism issued by our co-operative publishing house. This series was started in the spring of 1899 with two booklets, "Woman and the Social Problem," by May Wood Simons, and "The evolution of the Class Struggle," by William H. Noyes, both of which have subsequently been rewritten and have passed through a number of editions. The series now consists of thirty-eight numbers, including two new issues that have been brought out within the last few weeks. One of these, No. 37, is entitled "The Kingdom of God and Socialism," and is by Rev. Robert M. Webster, of Los Angeles. It was originally delivered as a sermon and it seemed to the Los Angeles comrades so effective as propaganda among religious people that they placed an advance order for 10,000 copies to be used for propaganda work in and around Los Angeles. The author has made a careful study of all passages in the New Testament where the Kingdom of God is mentioned, and holds that in each case the text points to a regenerated social order such as the Socialist Party is endeavoring to establish.

The other new issue, No. 38, is entitled "Easy Lessons in Socialism," and is by William H. Leffingwell, of Chicago. The ground covered in this booklet is familiar to Socialists but the treatment of the subject can be commended as specially suited to new beginners. We know of nothing else so well adapted to putting into the hands of wage workers as a means of interesting them in Socialism.

The booklets in this series are all uniform in style, each containing 32 pages with a red transparent parchment cover. They are just the size to slip into an ordinary business envelope, and they are light enough so that one can be mailed along with a letter of ordinary weight without requiring more than a two-cent stamp. The price, including postage, is 5 cents for a single copy; six for 25 cents; fourteen for 50 cents; thirty for \$1, or the full set of thirty-eight for \$1.25. Stockholders in our co-operative company can obtain them at \$1 a hundred, or 2 cents each, in smaller lots, postage included.

An Unexpected Help

As most readers of the International Socialist Review already know, the publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Company is owned, controlled and supported, not by any capitalist or group of capitalists but by six hun-

dred Socialists, most of them owning each a single share of stock. The increase in our line of Socialist books from half a dozen titles in 1899 to a hundred in 1903 is due not to the help of a capitalist but to the co-operation of laborers. There is nevertheless no reason why the money of a wealthy sympathizer should not be used effectively to hasten the circulation of the literature of socialism faster than would have been possible with the means already at our disposal, and the comrades in charge of the office of the co-operative company were therefore encouraged at receiving not long ago a letter from James W. Lee suggesting that he would be glad to pay for distributing a quantity of Socialist literature free by mail to as many towns and cities of the United States as the sum he was willing to expend on the experiment would admit. In answer to this letter we wrote him suggesting that to give away Socialist literature broadcast might result in wasting it on those who would destroy it without reading. We suggested the plan of offering Socialist books to such newspapers as would agree in return to publish an advertisement, offering to send the booklet "What to Read on Socialism" to any one asking for it. Comrade Lee accepted this suggestion as an improvement upon his original idea and he has already contributed \$800, which is being expended in this distribution of literature to editors.

If any reader of the REVIEW is acquainted with a non-Socialist editor who would like to read some of the standard Socialist books and would give advertising in return for them, we shall be glad to be advised of it.

Another Way to Help Socialism

A letter lately received from a Socialist comrade contains a suggestion which may prove so valuable that we take the liberty of reprinting it:

"I would like to know something about how to put things in such shape that some money will go to the cause of International Socialism in case I should suddenly meet death. . . . I don't propose to give anything as long as I am needing it, but I would like to know how it could be left so it would be sure to go to such a cause. I don't know just what course to pursue where it can be safe in leaving it; don't know that it can be so unless delivered beforehand."

The situation of this comrade is no doubt similar to that of many other Socialists, well along in years, who are unable to dispense with the income they derive from what little property they possess, but who would be glad to have that property used after their death for the benefit of the Socialist movement, if they could be sure that the matter could be arranged without the danger of litigation.

There is an easy and simple method of arranging such a transaction which is made possible by the fact that the co-operative publishing company which publishes the International Socialist Review is organized as a regular corporation and is on a basis where the sales of books pay the ordinary expenses of running the business. This company is thus in a position where it can make a contract to receive from any comrade whatever amount of money he may see fit to turn over to it and pay to him, during his lifetime, in monthly or quarterly installments, an income equal to from six to eight per cent per year on the capital received, the amount of the percentage depending on his age at the time of making the transfer.

By making such an arrangement the comrade investing the money can obtain from it while he lives an income equal to or somewhat greater than what he would draw from an ordinary commercial investment. We are in a position to give satisfactory security for the carrying out of such contracts, so that there need be no hesitation on the ground of risk.

The control of the company is in a board of directors elected annually by vote of the stockholders, and a majority of the stock is already held by over 600 Socialists, holding each a single share, so that the present board of directors can retain control only so long as they continue to satisfy the stockholders that the resources of the company are being used to the best of their ability to promote the cause of International Socialism; while in the event of the death or disability of the board of directors their places would be filled by men possessing the confidence of the Socialists of the United States. No other publishing house is so completely under the control of the Socialist party. The number of stockholders is increasing at the rate of about twenty-five a month, and the present organization is merely a nucleus around which an immense publishing house controlled collectively by the Socialists of America is almost certain to grow up.

Socialist Party Organization Fund

In the May number of the International Socialist Review, page 702, we announced the gift from William English Walling of twenty-five shares of stock in our co-operative publishing company, to be sold for the benefit of the organization fund of the Socialist Party of America. In response to this offer John Kerrigan, of Dallas, Texas; E. B. Amdahl, of Ullman, Minnesota, and David Phillips, of Pony, Montana, have each sent ten dollars and received a certificate for a share of stock, while the full amount of thirty dollars has been forwarded by us to William Mailly for the organization fund. Twenty-two more shares are still to be obtained on the same terms. We gladly repeat what has been said before, that the prompt raising of this organization fund is of the utmost importance to the cause of Socialism and we trust that other Socialists will follow the example of those whose names are here given.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers,
58 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.